

2014 Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Study

Report, Model, and Recommendations

FINAL

April 2, 2014

Karen Gottlieb, PhD JD
Court Consultant
Nederland, CO
gottlieb@courtconsultant.com

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
I. Background of the 2014 CWWL Study	2
II. Philosophy and Misperceptions of Weighted Workload Assessment Models	2
A. Why Do a Weighted Workload Study?	2
B. What Workload Assessment Models <i>Are</i>	3
C. What Workload Assessment Models <i>Are Not</i>	5
D. What Makes a Valid Weighted Workload Model?	5
E. Weighted Workload Model Assumptions	6
F. Common Misperceptions about Weighted Workload Models.	8
III. Research Design of the 2014 CWWL Study	10
A. Time Studies	10
B. Changes to the 2011 Case Categories	18
C. Changes to the 2011 Activity Categories	19
IV. Construction of the 2014 CWWL Model Components	21
A. Case Weights	21
B. Annual Filings	34
C. Average Annual Availability (AAA or Clerk Year)	34
D. Work-Related Travel Credit	47
E. Jury Management Credit	50
F. Total FTE Clerical Resource Demand	57
G. Authorized FTE Clerical Positions	57
H. The Bottom Line	57
V. Dissemination of Report and Model After CCBC Approval	58
VI. Conclusions and Recommendations	58

Appendix A. 2014 Clerical Weighted Work Load Work Group roster

Appendix B. FY 2015 CWWL Model using CY11-13 Original Filings: Final Draft

Appendix C. Time Study Results for Missouri Circuit Courts where the Circuit Clerk is also the Recorder of Deeds. Final Draft. April 3, 2014

Executive Summary

- Dr. Karen Gottlieb of *Court Consultant* was awarded the contract to conduct the 2014 Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload (CWWL) Study in April, 2013. She also conducted the previous four CWWL studies in 2002, 2005, 2008, and 2011.
- The Circuit Court Budget Committee (CCBC) appointed the CWWL Work Group to guide the study and approve the results in April, 2014.
- Twenty-seven courts of varying sizes participated in the Main Time Study in October, 2013. There were 460 participants and almost three million case and activity minutes collected.
- Jackson County represented the Metro Courts and conducted two-week time studies for both the Circuit Court and Family Court in November and December. There were 322 participants and over a million case and activity minutes collected.
- In addition, there were separate statewide time studies for treatment courts, jury management, and Recorder of Deeds activity to inform CWWL Model components.
- Twenty-two case weights were approved, including “case weights” for Garnishments and Executions, Treatment Court Admissions, and Passport Issuances.
- The CWWL14 Work Group approved an Average Annual Availability or “Clerk Year” of 104,060 minutes, or 218 480-minute workdays per FTE.
- The CWWL14 Model predicts a statewide need of 1883 FTE to process the Missouri Circuit Court clerical workload. This is 5% more than the current 1791 authorized clerical FTE positions (including the statutory Circuit Clerks).
- The CWWL14 Work Group on April 9, 2014 recommended by e-vote that the CCBC approve the 2014 Missouri CWWL Report and Model for use in determining clerical resource demand need in the next budget cycle.

This report explains the background, philosophy, research design, analyses, conclusions, and recommendations for the 2014 Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload (CWWL) Study.

I. Background of the 2014 CWWL Study

The 2014 CWWL Study began in April 2013 when Dr. Karen Gottlieb, Principal of *Court Consultant*, was awarded the contract based on her proposal in response to the Request for Proposals to conduct the study and update the 2011 CWWL Model. Dr. Gottlieb also conducted the 2002, 2005, 2008, and 2011 Missouri CWWL Studies and the 2003 Circuit Civil Time Intensive Study. Also in April the Circuit Court Budget Committee (CCBC) appointed the CWWL Work Group whose members were selected to represent judges, court administrators, and clerks from courts of different sizes, geographic areas, and expertise (see Appendix A).

The 2014 CWWL Work Group met for the first time on June 14, 2013. At that time the Work Group approved the case and activity categories, a proposed list of time study courts, the dates and lengths of the time studies, and the jury management instructions and forms. The second CWWL Work Group meeting was held on February 21, 2014 where they reviewed and approved the case weights. The third meeting was held on March 20, 2014 and the CWWL Work Group approved the following model components: Travel credit, Average Annual Availability, and Average Annual Filings. The Jury Management component was revised and submitted to the Work Group on March 28th for e-vote. The CWWL Work Group approved the jury management methodology on April 2nd. The final report and model was distributed to the CWWL Work Group on April 3rd for approval by e-vote.

II. Philosophy and Misperceptions of Weighted Workload Assessment Models

A. Why Do a Weighted Workload Study?

The CWWL is the method used to convert the court caseload into the amount of clerical time that will be required to process and dispose the cases – the workload. Merely summing the total number of cases filed is not a good indicator of the amount of time it will take to handle the caseload. Focusing solely on case counts, without assessing the differences in the amount of clerical time it takes to process different case types, means that 1,000 traffic cases are equivalent to 1,000 felonies. Comparing the weighted workloads of the courts takes into account the “mix”

of case types in the courts rather than the total number of new filings and is a more accurate predictor of the number of clerical staff needed to process the court's cases.

In 1983 Missouri court clerks became state employees. The weighted workload model provides the CCBC an objective process for ranking counties' clerical staffing needs based on relative workload. The county with the largest percentage workload per full-time equivalent (FTE) clerk that exceeds the authorized FTE may receive first priority for an increase in staff, if additional staff positions become available.

In addition, the clerical weighted workload is used as a statistically valid method to reimburse courts for Title IV-D claims. The weights are applied to IV-D cases handled by court offices to obtain a percentage that can be used by courts to claim Title IV-D program operational expenses. OSCA is required to update the CWWL Model every three years.

B. What Workload Assessment Models Are

Clerical workload assessment models are an attempt to objectively and quantitatively assess the number of clerical staff required to handle a court's caseload. Workload models can assume various forms, from simple algorithms to complex and sophisticated models. For example, a simple clerical algorithm may dictate three additional staff for each new judicial position. This algorithm is based on the experience of the judges that one additional courtroom clerk and two clerical staff are needed to support each judicial position.

A more sophisticated and accurate workload assessment model is a quantitative representation of inter-related variables. For example, a model can be constructed using the number of filings by case category, the number of days available to work during the year, the length of the workday, and time spent on non-case-related activities such as management or committee meetings. The "weighted" workload model that weights different case categories by the amount of time required to process the various case categories is an example of a more sophisticated and accurate workload model. The case weights, the average amount of time to process a case of a particular case category, can be determined by a time study. A weighted workload study converts caseload (the number of new filings a court has) to workload (the number of minutes of clerical time the court needs to process new filings from beginning to end). In a workload model based on case weights, a court receives more credit, for example, for a civil case than a traffic case, because on average more time is spent on a civil case than a traffic case.

In a weighted workload model, one county could have a greater annual total of new cases than a neighboring county, but still have a smaller workload, because proportionally more of the first county's cases are case categories with smaller case weights, such as traffic cases.

Basically, a weighted workload model consists of five components:

1. case weights (the average amount of case processing time for each of the case categories),
2. filings for the previous year for each of the case categories by county,
3. the average number of minutes in a year a clerk is available to work,
4. the number of minutes in a year a clerk spends on activities not directly related to a specific case category, and
5. the number of authorized clerical FTE positions.

Careful and accurate calculation of these components is crucial in constructing a valid and reliable weighted workload model.

The case weight and the average number of minutes a clerk spends on activities not directly related to a specific case category comes from the "time study". The time study is a period of time, usually a month, where the clerks record all the time they spend on clerical activities using specially designed codes. The goal of the time study is to account for all clerical work, including clerical activities related to case processing and activities not directly related to case processing like day-to-day management. Case weights are calculated from the information gathered in the time study along with (the fraction of the annual number of) new filings for the same period of time.

Workload models are often called objective because the assessment of a jurisdiction's workload is based on a quantitative approach that treats each county in a similar fashion based on external measurements of workload factors rather than how persuasive the county argues its need for additional positions with the administrative office of the courts or the legislature. This is not to say, however, that all jurisdictions are treated the same in a quantitative workload model. "Equitable" is a more correct adjective than "equal". For example, one jurisdiction may have two courthouses and the rest of the jurisdictions only have one courthouse. The jurisdiction with two courthouses needs to be credited with the additional travel time generated by two courthouses. When crediting courts on a "sliding scale" it is important to base the values on a quantitative characteristic grounded in real data. For example, jury management credit can be

predicted by using the sum of the annual General Circuit Civil and Circuit Felony cases in a jurisdiction.

C. What Workload Assessment Models *Are Not*

A time study-based weighted workload assessment model is not a performance evaluation of clerks. The data generated by a time study – when the clerks report what case category they are working on in ten-minute intervals – show how long clerks spend on the different case categories, it does not measure how well or how hard the clerks are working during the day.

A workload assessment study is not a time standard study, it does not follow individual cases from beginning to end and measure how many days it takes to dispose a case. Rather, the time study is a “window in time” and measures the amount of time spent on the cases coming through the court during that time period. Some cases will be new filings, some will be further along and coming up for trial, and other may have been closed previously and are re-opened during the time study for modification or probation violation. All this time on the various stages in the life of a case is captured during the time study and added to the case weight.

D. What Makes a Valid Weighted Workload Model?

The keys to a valid weighted workload model are careful data collection, large sample sizes, and sound statistical methodology. The data collection is focused on (1) the time study where the clerks report which case categories and activities they are working on, (2) the new filings occurring during the time study (or the number of new filings for the fraction of the year the time study represents), and (3) the annual filings (or an average of several recent years), with both (2) and (3) provided by the case management system by case category.

Thorough training on the time study case and activity categories, along with coding nuances, are important to ensure the clerks understand how they are to report their time. An assumption of the time study is a very large amount of good data will be collected and any incorrect coding by some clerks will not affect the statewide average. Some clerks may under-report a category, some may over-report a category, but the vast majority will report correctly and the case weight will reflect the central tendency, or average case weight, because of the large

number of minutes reported in the time study (over four million minutes in the 2014 Missouri CWWL Study).

The case category filings for the time study period and the previous year must be standardized across counties to ensure each county within a court system is counting new filings the same way. For example, if one county counts the temporary protection order and the full protection order as two separate filings and another county counts the two orders as one filing, there is a problem in filing consistency. Another example is whether three children in a family in an abuse and neglect case are counted as three cases or one case. A criminal case example would be whether probation violations are counted as a new case or as a re-opening of the original criminal case. For a valid time study, it does not matter which way the state counts new cases as long as each court in the state does it the same way.

The construction of the workload model must be grounded in sound statistical principles. Sample size comes into play in (1) the number of minutes reported for a case category, (2) the number of minutes reported for an activity, (3) the number of filings counted for a case category (statistical sampling error is probable when the number of filings falls below 30-35 for the time period), and (4) the number of courts in the time study. In general, the larger the sample size, the more accurate and valid are the data. The length of the time study period dictates the sample sizes, so the longer the time study, the more accurate and valid the model. The number of courts in the time study is also a crucial factor in ensuring statistical validity for the model. There should be a range of court sizes in the time study so any quantitative trends related to size of court (e.g., jury management) can be captured. Also, because the smallest courts will not have sufficient minutes or filings for many case categories, their data are aggregated and the number of courts in the study is reduced further.

E. Weighted Workload Model Assumptions

All models have assumptions. A defining characteristic of models is they are *not* exact replicas of reality, but are based on general assumptions. A model is not lacking if it has assumptions, but if the assumptions are not generally true, the integrity of the model is jeopardized.

One of the assumptions in a weighted workload model is the statewide case weight estimates how long it should take on average to process a case in a particular case category from

beginning to end in all the counties. Some courts may be a little slower and some may be a little faster because of factors unique to a court, but *in general*, the statewide case weight reflects how long it should take to process the case. If this is not true, for example civil cases have more hearings because of local court rules, the statewide case weight will not be a good estimate for that county. Another example is from a different perspective, how much time is available for each clerk to process cases during the year? If a statewide annual number of sick leave days is applied to all courts and a particular court usually has much more than that amount for whatever reason, the model is not a good estimate for that court and would show a need for fewer clerks than are really required to process the workload during the time period of excess sick leave.

A balance between using statewide averages and individual court data must be struck to make the model valid for determining which courts need additional resources. Models cannot be so complicated that data is collected on everything for every court and each court is credited with the time they actually spend on different activities. There are three reasons why workload models are not constructed this way. One, it would be too expensive and labor intensive to collect all the data needed to do such as individualized model. The second reason is there is an underlying philosophy in workload models that some sort of best practices should be strived for when assessing the need for additional resources. In other words, a slow and inefficient court should not be rewarded for their slowness and inefficiency by receiving extra resources. By using the statewide average, courts are not required to be the fastest, but only to achieve the middle ground. The third reason involves the ease of updating the model on a yearly basis – usually the only changes made are substituting current filing numbers and adjusting the number of FTE clerical staff by any changes during the year. A more complicated model with many individualized values would not allow easy updating. The best model is the one that is simple, yet provides the information needed for making resource allocation decisions.

There are other assumptions in weighted workload models. One is the courts in the time study are a representative sample of all the courts in the state. Similarly, there is an assumption the time study period is a representative period and annual case and activity category values can be extrapolated from the time study period.

Another assumption of a workload model is some values may be a high estimate and some values may be a low estimate for particular counties; but all in all, the highs and lows balance out and the result is a reliable and accurate estimate when data collection is careful,

sample sizes are sufficient, and sound statistical reasoning is used to calculate the values in the model.

It is important to keep in mind the model is based on the 95 percent situation. All courts have times of increased work activity, such as a capital murder trial or a complex product liability case. These examples are the five percent of the time when some activities must be put on the back burner or extra help in the form of temporary clerks must be brought in. A court is not regularly staffed for these out-of-the-ordinary situations.

F. Common Misperceptions about Weighted Workload Models.

Below are some common misperceptions.

1. Counties receive the times in the workload model they reported during the time study and can look busier than they really are by “over-reporting”. Reality: Courts do not receive the amount of time they reported. Instead the information on the case categories and activities reported during the time study is used in statistical formulas to construct statewide values (usually averages) applied to all courts.
2. Case processing time after disposition, such as probation violations or domestic relations order modifications, is not included in the case weight. Reality: All work on a case, pre-judgment and post-judgment, is included in the case weight even if the case is re-opened years after originally being disposed. Time spent on these examples is counted in the weighted workload model as part of the original case filing and hence increases the case weight. For example, suppose the Domestic Relations case weight is 300 minutes when the time spent on child support modifications is not included, but is 400 minutes when it is included. For every Domestic Relations filing, the county receives 100 minutes of time in the weighted workload model for child support modifications. Of course, some cases involve much more time for child support modifications, but many cases will not have any time spent on child support modifications, so the case weight is an average. The same methodology applies for probation violations in felony and misdemeanor cases; the case weights include time for processing any post-judgment probation violations.
3. Counties with a higher volume of otherwise infrequent case types do not receive credit for the increased volume they experience. Reality: Volume is accounted for in

the weighted workload model and courts do receive credit for all their filings on a county-by-county basis. If a county has more filings for a certain case category, more time is being credited toward the weighted workload because workload is the product of case weight multiplied by number of filings. Involuntary Detention Petition cases are a good example. A county that has more Involuntary Detention Petition cases because there is a mental health hospital in its jurisdiction is receiving credit for the extra work because a larger number of Involuntary Detention Petition filings will be entered in the model for that county.

4. Activities not occurring during the time study are not correctly credited. Reality: Not all values in the model come from the time study. Activities that occur sporadically, such as training, are credited in the model according to work group input. For example, some clerks report training time during the time study, but the five days of training per staff member credited in the 2014 CWWL Model was a policy decision of the 2014 CWWL Work Group to ensure time for the clerks to take advantage of the (OSCA) training opportunities.
5. Some courts are treated unfairly because they have to do more of one activity than courts in other counties. An example of this is a greater frequency of jury trials in some courts (even when courts are the same size as one another) because of the county prosecutor's style. Reality: The general philosophy underlying the weighted workload model is although a court may have more of this or that activity than another county, there are some activities the court has less of, or an activity it does not have to do. For example, although one county receives credit in the weighted workload model for the average amount of time spent on jury management and this amount is less than the court actually spends on jury management, it also will receive daily credit for traveling to the bank or post office and this might be an activity the court does not have to do at all. The basic philosophy is it all balances out.

III. Research Design of the 2014 CWWL Study

A. Time Studies

Main Time Study. There were 27 courts in the Main Time Study, five more courts than in 2010. The Main Time Study began on Tuesday, October 1, 2013 and ended Thursday, October 31, 2013 – for a total of 22 work days, two more days than in 2010. Unlike in the 2010 time study when most of the courts volunteered to participate, the 2013 time study courts were chosen to fulfill certain criteria. The primary criterion was courts of all sizes were chosen and each size cluster contained a total of at least 40 FTE to ensure sufficient sample size to create statistically reliable case weights. Equally important was that either all the courts or none of the courts in a cluster had implemented e-filing. A third criterion was the authorized FTE clerical positions were within $\pm 15\%$ of the resource demand predicted by the 2011 CWWL model. Also, courts in the two previous CWWL time studies (2007 and 2010) were not asked to participate in the 2013 time study. Although the presence of a treatment court or a Circuit Clerk who is also a Recorder of Deeds was a positive factor, the other criteria were more important because additional non-Main Time Study courts were asked to volunteer for the Treatment Court and Recorder of Deeds Mini-Time Studies. The selection process attempted to include a range of Document Management System (DMS) utilization. The following courts (with their authorized FTE clerical positions) participated in the Main Time Study (the Metro Court, Jackson County – 196.8 FTE, was Cluster 1).

Cluster 2 (E-Filing Court)

Greene	83 FTE
--------	--------

Cluster 3

Boone	42 FTE
-------	--------

Cluster 4

Cole	24.5750 FTE
Platte	23 FTE

Cluster 5 (E-Filing Courts)

Callaway	12.5 FTE
Scott	17 FTE
Stoddard	13 FTE

Cluster 6

Adair	7.6 FTE
Audrain	7.0 FTE
Texas	6.9375 FTE
Vernon	7 FTE
Washington	8 FTE
Wright	6.6750 FTE

Cluster 7

Barton	3.45 FTE
Bollinger	3.6250 FTE
Caldwell	3 FTE
Carter	3 FTE
Daviess	3 FTE
DeKalb	3.8 FTE
Douglas	4 FTE
Grundy	3.8 FTE
Howard	2.8 FTE
Lewis	3 FTE
Moniteau	3.3 FTE
Osage	3.25 FTE
Ozark	3.3 FTE
Ralls	3.3 FTE

All the Main Time Study courts were trained to complete the time sheet remotely using the JEWELS webinar training system between September 11th and 26th. Participants had a choice of either registering for a webinar led by Karen Gottlieb that covered all case categories and activities or registering for one of the seven self-paced webinars that focused on specific case categories and activities for more specialized courts, as well as a general webinar. All participants were required to complete a one-day practice time sheet to ensure understanding of the time study coding before the first day of the time study. All practice time sheets were reviewed by Karen Gottlieb who provided feedback to the participants before the time study began, resulting in fewer coding mistakes on the first day.

The month-long time study was monitored remotely by Dr. Gottlieb. Courts faxed or scanned their time sheets daily to Karen who reviewed them daily for coding discrepancies. She emailed or phoned the participants with any questions the next work day to ensure any reporting problems were dealt with in a timely manner.

All state-paid clerical staff and Circuit Clerks in the time study courts participated. An exception was temporary staff in state-paid “Special Assistance” positions who were helping courts prepare for e-filing by scanning open cases. In addition, there were other participants who perform “clerical tasks”; such as presiding judge secretaries, bailiffs, domestic violence advocates, county-paid clerical staff, and county-paid recorder staff. This additional group only reported the “clerical” portion of their work. There were 460 participants, 33% more than in the 2010 time study when there were 311 participants. There were 2,915,968 case and activity minutes reported in the Main Time Study, an increase of 21% compared to 2010 when 2,302,970 minutes were reported.

Metro Court Time Study. Jackson County represented the metropolitan courts in the time study. There were 322 participants including 207 based in the Circuit Court located in Kansas City, 82 based in Independence, and 33 at the Family Court. Participants included Circuit Court staff, Family Court staff, Trial Court Administrator staff, and the Civil Process staff. There were 76 more participants than in the 2010 Metro Time Study when St. Louis County represented the metro courts. Time study training was done on-site by Karen Gottlieb and Nancy Griggs from Monday, November 4 through Thursday, November 7, 2013 and all participants completed a practice day time study that was reviewed and feedback was provided by the end of the training week. The time study began on Tuesday, November 12th and ended on Friday, November 22nd. The data from Monday, November 18th was doubled to also represent Monday, November 11th that was a state holiday. The time study for the three full-time jury management staff was conducted between October 28th and November 8th to avoid a week where jury management activities might be atypical because Monday and Tuesday are days the potential jurors are summoned to appear. The time study in the Family Court was two weeks later (December 2nd through Friday December 13th) because they implemented e-filing in early November. There were 1,087,705 case and activity minutes collected during the two-week Metro Time Study, including the Family Court Time Study. This is 14% more minutes than the 939,510 case and

activity minutes reported during the 10 days of the Metro Court Time Study in St. Louis County in 2010. These total minutes do not include the 42,000 minutes reported during the time study for “prepping and scanning” activities that were being done by Jackson County clerks as time allowed.¹

Treatment Court Mini-Time Study. The Treatment Court Mini-Time Study for the non-Metro courts covered the same period as the Main Time Study, October 1 through October 31, 2013. The City of St. Louis metro court’s two-week time study for treatment court activities was November 12 through Monday, November 25, 2013. Jackson County’s Circuit Court’s two-week time study was the same as the Metro Time Study, November 12th through November 22nd with the minutes from Monday the 18th doubled. The Jackson County Family Court Treatment Court Time Study covered the same period as the Jackson County Family Court Time Study, December 2nd through December 13th. Unlike previous Treatment Court Mini-Time Studies, all non-judicial officer Treatment Court activity was collected, not just the “clerical” activities. This meant the Treatment Court Administrator/Coordinator had to agree to participate in the time study if that court was to be included. It also meant that if a treatment court included more than one county, clerks in all the counties had to agree to participate. These two requirements meant that some of the treatment court minutes collected during the Main Time Study were not included in the Treatment Court case weight analysis because the collected data were incomplete. The courts had the option of submitting daily time sheets in ten-minute intervals or weekly time sheets where the exact minutes of treatment court activity were reported.

Unlike the 2010 time study, the participants did not identify the specific treatment court in their reporting if the county had more than one treatment court. The activity codes were very similar to those in 2010 and were the same in the Main, Metro, and Treatment Court Time Studies. The codes and examples are below.

¹These 42,000 minutes are not part of the current workload but are archival activities that are being done to decrease the number of old, closed files that are being stored off-site in the “cave”.

- YC Courtroom clerk duties for treatment court including sound recording and taking notes,
- YD JIS docketing and calendaring for treatment court (done in the courtroom or office),
- All activities related to keeping the treatment court file including opening and closing the file, and
 - Includes docketing RANT results and issuing warrants,
- YE Receipting fines and fees, including transfer of money to treatment court,
- YF ALL OTHER treatment court activities
- Communicating with other team members or treatment staff/providers,
 - Preparing or attending staffing or management team meetings,
 - Responding to participants in person on the phone or via email,
 - Tracking financial balances owed by participants, paying bills, or submitting financial records to OSCA,
 - Attending graduations and other social events, including buying incentives and snacks,
 - Travel to treatment court in other counties,
 - Preparing grants or reports for outside agencies, and
 - Processing Limited Driving Privileges (LDP) applications.

There were 18 counties and 32 treatment courts in the Treatment Court Mini-Time Study. Courts also in the Main and Metro Court Time Studies that reported treatment court activity that was used in the development of the Treatment Court case weight were:

<i>County</i>	<i>Treatment Court Types</i>
Adair	DWI/Drug
Audrain	Adult Drug, DWI
Barton	DWI/Drug
Boone	Re-Entry, Adult Drug, DWI, Mental Health
Callaway	DWI/Drug
Cole	Adult Drug, DWI, Juvenile
Douglas	Adult DWI/Drug, Juvenile

Jackson	Adult & Co-Occurring, Veterans, Family
Lewis	Adult DWI/Drug
Ozark	DWI/Drug
Platte	DWI
Stoddard	DWI/Drug
Vernon	DWI/Drug
Washington	DWI/Drug
Wright	DWI/Drug, Juvenile.

Counties and treatment courts that volunteered to participate were:

Buchanan	Adult Drug
City of St. Louis	Adult Drug, Juvenile, Veterans, Family
St Charles	Adult Drug, DWI.

Counties that were in the Main Time Study but did not participate in the Treatment Court Time Study because the county did not have a treatment court, all treatment staff did not participate, or other miscellaneous reasons were:

Bollinger
Caldwell
Carter
Daviess
DeKalb
Greene
Howard
Grundy
Moniteau
Osage
Ralls
Scott
Texas.

There were 132,149 minutes reported in the Treatment Court Mini-Time Study, this includes 2,670 usable minutes from the Main Time Study, 18,500 minutes from the Metro Time Study, and 110,979 minutes from the non-clerical Main Time Study participants and the participants from the treatment courts who volunteered.

Jury Management Mini-Time Study. An objective of the 2014 CWWL Study was to increase the reliability and validity of the jury management credit given in the workload model. While the 2011 methodology that required a court to capture an entire jury term's worth of data was successful and this methodology was repeated in 2014, one change made was collapsing the

six activity categories into two: JMP – which was all jury management activity up to the start of *voir dire*; and JMT – which was all jury management activity after *voir dire* began. In this way, courts that spent time preparing jury pools but had few or no jury trials occur, still received credit in the model for jury management. The second change was to collect the number of jury trials that reached the *voir dire* stage (or further) during the court’s participation in the Jury Management Time Study. This was done to obtain a more accurate number of jury trials for the analysis compared to previous years when the annual jury trial information was collected from the OSCA annual report and adjusted for the size of the jury term. An email was sent to all courts in late June asking for volunteers to participate in the Jury Management Time Study that would last as long as their jury term. Courts with a jury term of one year were not eligible for the time study and courts with a six-month jury term had to start the time study on July 1st to allow for six months of activity before December 31st.

Twenty-eight courts reported information on their jury management activity for the length of one term or longer. Courts with an asterisk also were in the Main or Metro Court Time Studies.

Weekly or Less Term

Greene*
Jackson*
St. Louis County

Two-Month Term

Boone*

Three-Month Term

Audrain*
Carter*
Cole*
McDonald

Four-Month Term

Cape Girardeau
Daviess*
DeKalb*
Lafayette
Moniteau*

Newton
Phelps
Platte*
Ralls*
Scott*
Stoddard*
Texas*

Six-Month Term

Adair*
Cedar
Cooper
Crawford
Ozark*
Ripley*
Ste. Genevieve
Vernon*

Greene County reported all their jury management activity during the October Main Time Study. Jackson County reported two weeks of jury management activity prior to the Metro Time Study to avoid the “missing Monday” of Veterans’ Day. St. Louis County jury management staff reported only JMP (pre-*voir dire*) activity for a two-week period between Monday, October 28th and Friday, November 5th. The other courts in the Main Time Study needed to report additional jury management activity in addition to the October time study to capture an entire term’s worth of activity. Sixteen of the remaining 27 courts that had jury terms longer than one month did participate for additional months for the length of their jury term. For the 12 that did not, their jury management activity reported during the Main Time Study was not used in any jury management analysis or calculations because October would not be representative of activities during the entire jury term.

There were a total of 212,096 Jury Management minutes reported; 174,496 (82%) were JMP and 37,600 (18%) were JMT. The information collected from the 28 courts was used in a bifurcated regression analysis with the sum of the annual Circuit Civil and Circuit Felony cases used to estimate JMP time and the number of reported jury trials used to estimate JMT time for all 115 Circuit Courts.

Recorder of Deeds Mini-Time Study. The Recorder of Deeds Time Study was a new addition to the CWWL Study. The 2011 CWWL model gave 0.2 FTE workload credit to a Circuit Clerk who was also a Recorder of Deeds. Previous to 2011, the workload credit had been 0.5 FTE. The change was made by the CCBC based on an *ad hoc* study of Recorder of Deeds time reported by the Circuit Clerks in the 2010 Main Time Study. Because the 2011 *ad hoc* study was based on only five counties, a larger Recorder of Deeds study was planned for 2013. All but one of the 20 courts that had Circuit Clerks who also were Recorder of Deeds participated in a month-long time study in October. Five of the courts (Grundy, Howard, Moniteau, Ozark, and Ralls) also were in the Main Time Study so they reported their Recorder of Deeds time as part of the daily reporting. The other counties completed weekly time sheets that captured Recorder of Deeds time spent by either the Circuit Clerk or one of the Circuit Court deputy clerks, but not the county-paid Recorder of Deeds staff. All 19 courts reported Recorder of Deeds activity in October for a total of 26,392 minutes. Eighteen Circuit Clerks contributed 17,064 minutes (65%) and 25 Deputy Circuit Clerks contributed 9,328 minutes (35%).

B. Changes to the 2011 Case Categories

One of the basic steps in designing a weighted workload study is aggregating the hundreds of case *types* a case management system counts into a more manageable number of case *categories*. The idea behind the categorization is to aggregate similar case types together. For example, all General Circuit Civil case types can be aggregated together under one case category. A good number of case categories for a consolidated court system such as Missouri's is between 15 and 20 case categories (not counting the fictive case categories such as Treatment Court, Passport Issuance, and Executions and Garnishments). The greater the number of case categories, the more accurate and equitable the weighted workload model is, but the number of case categories needs to be balanced against the ease and accuracy in reporting during the time study. In addition, the more case categories there are, the fewer number of filings for each case category there are during the time study period. During the time study period there needs to be enough data (minutes and filings) collected on each of the case categories to ensure there are not statistical problems due to a small sample size. Ideally, one would expect at least 30-35 filings for each case category per county during the time study period.

As in 2010, the number of docket entries and parties for the Circuit Civil case types were analyzed to identify the Circuit Civil Time Intensive case types. To update this information, the JIS system was queried for total docket entries for each Circuit Civil case disposed in 2012 and queried for number of parties filed in 2012. To ensure all sub-cases were included in the analysis the query was done by master case id. The results of the updated docket entry and party queries showed some case types moved significantly up or down the scale. The CWWL Work Group approved 78 docket entries as the dividing line between Circuit Civil Time Intensive and General Circuit Civil. These case types moved from Circuit Civil Time Intensive in 2011 to General Circuit Civil in 2014:

TD Personal Injury-Product Liability

TH Wrongful Death.

These case types moved from General Circuit Civil in 2011 to Circuit Civil Time Intensive in 2014:

RA Application to Enforce Mechanics Lien

RB Eminent Domain/Condemnation.

In addition, these two case types were moved from Incapacitated Estates to Simple Probate:

G1 Registration of Foreign Guardian/Conservator – Adult

G2 Registration of Foreign Guardian/Conservator – Minor.

C. Changes to the 2011 Activity Categories

The goal of a weighted workload study is to account in the time study for all clerical activities. So, the first step of a weighted workload study is to determine *what are*, and *what are not*, clerical activities, that is, what are a clerk's duties and responsibilities? Clerical activities are not ALL the things a clerk might do during the day. One example that makes the point is answering a phone call about recording a deed if the Clerk of Court is also the Recorder of Deeds. It might be something she does wearing her Recorder of Deeds hat, but it is not a clerical activity. The second step is to determine which activities can be related to a specific case category (e.g., Circuit Felony, Domestic Relations). Why? Because activities that can be related to a specific case category, like Child Support Collection activities, can be incorporated into the

case weight (e.g., Domestic Relations) and increase the weighted workload of a court as filings increase over time.

There is no set rule as to how activities are categorized. In fact, the activity categories do not directly affect the case weights. But, the activity information can be used to see where clerks are spending their time and to help in allocating workload within a court. For example, clerks may not think the time they spend on post-judgment activities, such as probation violations or motions to modify domestic relations cases, is counted in their workload because the post-judgment activity is not counted as a separate “case”. By making post-judgment activity a separate activity code during the time study, it is possible to determine how much time these time study courts spend on post-judgment activities within various case categories. Also, there maybe some activities of interest to OSCA, such as the amount of time spent coordinating interpreters, that are not needed specifically to construct the workload model, but can be used to support legislative or grant funding requests.

For ease in time study reporting, the number of activity categories needs to be kept to a reasonable number. We want to identify those activities that should have their own code so that we know how much time is being spent on them. Activities for which we do not need to know how much time is spent specifically can be grouped in the “All Other Category”. The CWWL Work Group approved keeping the 2011 Case-Related Categories of:

- Child Support Collection
- Post-Judgment Activity
- “All Other”.

The CWWL Work Group approved keeping the same Non-Case-Related Activity Categories from 2011, but after the meeting approved by e-vote the addition of a code that reported Coordination of Interpreter activity.

The CWWL Work Group also approved the merger of the six 2011 jury management activities into two major activity categories: JMP, Creating the Pool of Qualified Potential Jurors and Summoning Jurors to a Trial and JMT, Handling Jurors for a Specific Trial.

IV. Construction of the 2014 CWWL Model Components

A. Case Weights

Case weights, core components of the workload model that measure how long it takes to process cases of different case categories, are based on minutes collected during the time study and the number of new filings that occurred during the time study (or the same fraction of the year as the time study period). The statewide case weights were constructed using two different methodologies (Median Method and Mean Method) depending on sample size of new cases.

Case-Related Minutes. The base case weights, core components of the workload model that measure how long it takes to process cases of different case categories, are comprised of the case-related activity minutes reported during the time study. Table 1 shows the distribution of activities associated with the case categories in the Main Time Study courts, and Table 2 shows the distribution in the Metro Time Study court. Some points to note in the Main Time Study courts:

- For most case categories, by far the majority of time is spent doing pre-judgment case processing, records management, and responding to questions from the public.
- Even though the collection of child support monies was centralized some time ago, Child Support Collection activities account for 16% of the Domestic Relations minutes. The Child Support Collection activities were 21% in 2011, 25% in 2008, 22% in 2005, and 30% in 2002.
- One-third (31%) of Circuit Felony clerical time, but only 14% of Misdemeanor clerical time are spent on post-judgment activities.

Points to note in the Metro Time Study court:

- The Child Support Collection activities only account for 12% of the Domestic Relations minutes.
- Almost half (48%) of Circuit Felony minutes are post-judgment.

Table 1. Distribution of Case-Related Activities in Main Time Study Courts

Case Category	Child Support Collection	Post-Judgment	“All Other” Case-Related	Total Case-Related
General Circuit Civil	0	7,540 (6%)	121,893 (94%)	129,433
Time Intensive CC	0	320 (46%)	380 (54%)	700
Simple Circuit Civil	0	1,930 (4%)	40,670 (96%)	42,600
Domestic Relations	56,070 (16%)	25,070 (7%)	273,853 (77%)	354,993
Protection Order	0	4,530 (4%)	103,611 (96%)	108,141
Associate Civil	0	17,780 (7%)	245,972 (93%)	263,752
Small Claims	0	1,800 (9%)	18,652 (91%)	20,452
Adoption	0	1,540 (17%)	7,510 (83%)	9,050
Abuse&Neglect/TPR	0	2,100 (3%)	71,434 (97%)	73,534
Juvenile Delinq.	0	1,910 (10%)	17,122 (90%)	19,032
Circuit Felony	0	96,747 (31%)	219,687 (69%)	316,436
Associate Felony	0	10,000 (7%)	142,305 (93%)	152,305
Misdemeanor	0	52,840 (14%)	338,350 (86%)	391,190
Traffic	0	31,360 (21%)	120,280 (79%)	151,640
Decedent Estate	0	3,510 (5%)	65,990 (95%)	69,500
Incap./Minor Estate	0	8,880 (8%)	104,290 (92%)	113,170
Simple Probate	0	340 (1%)	26,320 (99%)	26,660
Invol. Detention	0	60 (3%)	2,210 (97%)	2,270
96 Hour Detention App.	0	120 (2%)	7,310 (98%)	7,430
TOTAL	56,070 (2%)	268,379 (12%)	1,927,839 (86%)	2,252,288

Table 2. Distribution of Case-Related Activities in Metro Time Study Courts

Case Category	Child Support Collection	Post-Judgment	"All Other" Case-Related	Total Case-Related
General Circuit Civil	0	5,440 (7%)	72,320 (93%)	77,760
Time Intensive CC	0	60 (15%)	340 (85%)	400
Simple Circuit Civil	0	530 (6%)	7,910 (94%)	8,440
Domestic Relations	13,920 (12%)	17,560 (15%)	88,580 (74%)	120,060
Protection Order	0	0	50,924 (100%)	50,924
Associate Civil	0	5,630 (5%)	119,500 (95%)	125,130
Small Claims	0	80 (1%)	7,430 (99%)	7,510
Adoption	0	2,020 (31%)	4,530 (69%)	6,550
Abuse&Neglect/TPR	0	9,290 (21%)	34,990 (79%)	44,280
Juvenile Delinq.	0	3,100 (16%)	16,245 (84%)	19,345
Circuit Felony	0	59,100 (48%)	64,270 (52%)	123,370
Associate Felony	0	13,560 (25%)	41,240 (75%)	54,800
Misdemeanor	0	5,310 (28%)	13,380 (72%)	18,690
Traffic	0	5,990 (25%)	17,530 (75%)	23,520
Decedent Estate	0	14,440 (41%)	21,580 (48%)	35,580
Incap./Minor Estate	0	17,220(52%)	15,770 (48%)	32,990
Simple Probate	0	400 (7%)	5,350 (93%)	5,750
Invol. Detention	0	0	1,360 (100%)	1,360
96 Hour Detention App.	0	0	2,250 (100%)	2,250
TOTAL	13,920 (2%)	159,730 (21%)	585,059 (77%)	758,709

Non-Case-Related Minutes. Non-case-related activities are clerical activities such as personnel supervision or financial processing activities that are not directly related to a specific case category. In the 2013 Main and Metro Time Studies, the following non-case-related activity minutes were reported:

- General Customer Service
- Financial Processing
- Personnel Supervision
- Day-to-Day Management
- Coordination of Interpreters
- *Training and Staff Development*
- *Work-Related Travel*

In this and previous CWWL models, Training and Staff Development and Work-Related Travel were separated from the other non-case-related activities and credited in the model as a separate line item. See Section IV. C, Average Annual Availability.

The remaining five non-case-related activities are grouped together and handled as “overhead” in the CWWL Model. Table 3 shows the distribution of these five non-case-related activities by cluster size. The range of non-case-related percentages is from 13% to 19% with a mean of 16%. There is no relationship between size of cluster and percentage of non-case-related activities. On average, the time study courts reported 84 percent of their activity as case-related. This is the same percentage as in the 2011 CWWL Study.

Table 3. Distribution of Non-Case-Related (NCR) Activities by Size Cluster (in minutes)*

Non-Case-Related Activity	Cluster1*	Cluster2	Cluster 3	Cluster4	Cluster5	Cluster6	Cluster7	Total Non-Case-Related
General Customer Service	9,230	2,580	830	2,470	3,140	6,120	5,850	30,220
Financial Processing	23,750	12,360	12,450	15,450	9,300	13,530	12,910	99,750
Personnel Supervision	31,940	14,050	11,860	3,520	3,610	740	1,000	66,720
Day-to-Day Management	108,280	68,130	48,390	65,540	34,770	46,940	48,540	420,590
Coordination Interpreters	1,076	0	470	120	30	30	70	1796
NCR Total	174,276**	97,120	74,000	87,100	50,850	67,360	68,370	619,106
Total Case-Related +NCR	1,026,255 (17%)	751,740 (13%)	417,750 (18%)	465,850 (19%)	377,829 (14%)	407,430 (16%)	442,129 (16%)	3,888,983 (16%)

*Cluster 1 is the largest court (Jackson County) in the study. Cluster 7 is the 14 courts with 4 or fewer FTE.

** Cluster 1 minutes were reported over a 10-day period. Clusters 2-7 minutes were reported over a 22-day period.

Non-Case-Related Minutes Added to Case-Related Minutes. To incorporate the non-case-related activities directly into the case weight, the non-case-related minutes need to be calculated by county. Table 4 shows the minutes from the five non-case-related categories by county and as a percentage of total workload (case-related minutes + non-case-related minutes). The percentage of non-case-related activity (or “overhead”) ranges from 7 to 24 percent. Just as there is no relationship between size of cluster and non-case-related activity percentage, there is no relationship between percentage of non-case-related activity and size of the court measured in FTE ($r^2 = .001$, $p = .852$). A court’s non-case-related time is added proportionally to the minutes reported for case-related work to “even out” the time study minutes between courts (for example, Carter and Ozark) and make for a better fitting model. In addition, adding the non-case-related minutes to the case weights means as the filings increase and decrease for a specific case category in the three years between models, the “overhead” adjusts accordingly.

Table 4. Percentage of Non-Case-Related (NCR) Minutes by County

Cluster	County	Case-Related Minutes	NCR* Minutes	Other** Minutes	Total Minutes	% NCR Minutes
7	Barton	27,845	5,460	3,230	36,535	16%
7	Bollinger	27,540	4,210	2,030	33,780	13%
7	Caldwell	21,070	2,280	190	23,540	10%
7	Carter	20,820	1,640	1,010	23,470	7%
7	Daviess	26,730	5,820	50	32,600	18%
7	DeKalb	32,170	7,160	790	40,120	18%
7	Douglas	28,777	5,240	1,030	35,047	15%
7	Grundy	27,360	6,240	740	34,340	19%
7	Howard	25,730	5,650	280	31,660	18%
7	Lewis	20,530	3,420	360	24,310	14%
7	Moniteau	28,040	7,100	1,330	36,470	20%
7	Osage	25,640	2,920	530	29,090	10%
7	Ozark	20,457	6,530	920	27,907	24%
7	Ralls	28,000	4,700	560	33,260	14%
6	Adair	59,450	5,770	180	65,400	9%
6	Audrain	66,735	7,440	1,420	75,595	10%
6	Texas	48,650	15,440	110	64,200	24%
6	Vernon	53,050	6,460	250	59,760	11%
6	Washington	63,430	18,790	1,160	83,380	23%
6	Wright	44,565	13,460	1,070	59,095	23%
5	Callaway	87,690	18,700	1,730	108,120	18%
5	Scott	129,639	18,860	9,100	157,599	13%
5	Stoddard	95,710	13,290	3,110	112,110	12%
4	Cole	183,740	51,420	8,320	243,480	22%
4	Platte	182,290	35,680	4,400	222,370	16%
3	Boone	321,120	74,000	22,630	417,750	18%
2	Greene	646,490	97,120	8,130	751,740	13%
1	Jackson	824,189	174,276	27,790	1,026,255	17%
*General Customer Service, Day-to-Day Management, Financial Processing, Interpreter Coordination, Personnel Supervision						
** Training and Staff Development, Work-Related Travel, Recorder of Deeds						

Table 5 shows how non-case-related minutes are proportionally distributed to the different case categories. Boone County reported 74,000 minutes of non-case-related activities (i.e., General Customer Service, Financial Processing, Personnel Supervision, and Day-to-Day Management) that are not directly related to a specific case category. There are 321,120 minutes that were related to a specific case category. The 74,000 non-case-related minutes were added to the case-related minutes according to what percentage the particular case category was of the whole. For example, the case category AC (Associate Civil) comprises 11.41% ($36,650/321,120$) of the total case-related minutes, so AC receives 11.41% of the non-case-related minutes or 8,446 minutes. The assumption is that case categories that take more of the clerk's time also need proportionally more "overhead" time. The 2002, 2005, 2008, and 2011 CWWL models also used this methodology to incorporate the non-case-related activity.

Table 5. Example Showing Addition of Non-Case-Related Minutes

Boone County	Case-Related Minutes	Non-Case- Related Minutes	Total Minutes
Associate Civil/Small Claims	45,096	9,693	51,752
Simple Circuit Civil	5,250	1,210	6,460
General Circuit Civil	14,480	3,337	17,817
Domestic Relations	52,470	12,091	64,561
Protection Orders	14,930	3,441	18,371
Associate Felony	23,600	5,438	29,038
Circuit Felony	21,530	4,961	26,491
Misdemeanor	64,670	14,903	79,573
Traffic	20,420	4,706	25,126
Time Intensive	20	5	25
Juvenile Delinquency	6,090	1,403	7,493
Abuse/Neglect	5,880	1,355	7,235
Adoption	2,180	502	2,682
Execution/Garnishment	12,850	2,961	15,811
Decedent Estates	9,450	2,178	11,628
Incapacitated/Minor Estates	19,990	4,607	24,597
Simple Probate	1,140	263	1,403
Involuntary Detention	1,580	364	1,944
96 Hour Detention Application	2,530	583	3,113
Passport Application	0	0	0
TOTAL	321,120	74,000	395,120

Case Weight Construction. Statewide case weights can be constructed in two ways – the Median Method and the Mean Method. Both methods depend on a time study to collect information on how long it takes to process different case categories. The methods differ in how the time study information is analyzed. Both methods were used to construct case weights for the 2014 CWWL Model – the Median Method for case weights with a larger sample size and the

Mean Method for those where time study data sample was insufficient (fewer than 30 filings during the time study) for the Median Method.

A change in methodology from the earlier CWWL studies is rather than use the number of new cases filed during the actual days of the time study as the denominator in the case weight formula, it makes more sense to enter a fractional number of annual filings that corresponds to the number of days in the time study. For example, the 22 days of the Main Time Study represent 0.0887 of the annual workdays of the Missouri Courts ($22/248$ or 365 days minus weekends and 13 state holidays) and the 10 days of the Metro Time Study represents 0.0403 of the annual workdays. The previous method assumed the majority of clerical activity on a case occurred at filing. The new method assumes the majority of the clerical activity occurs throughout the subsequent months.

In the Median Method, similarly sized courts are clustered into groups that will yield statistically reliable case weights. The 28 time study courts were grouped into seven clusters from largest to smallest courts. The cluster with the smallest courts had four or fewer clerical staff in each court. Case weights for each case category are constructed for each cluster using the Median Method where sample size allows. The total number of minutes (case-related plus non-case-related) in a cluster is divided by the number of new filings for the cluster based on the fraction of new filings for the year. For example, the Circuit Felony case weight for Cluster 3 (Boone County) was calculated by dividing 26,491 minutes by 89 filings. The result is a case weight for Cluster 3 of 298 minutes. When a cluster is composed of more than one court, all the minutes are added together for a particular case category from each court and then divided by the total fraction of new filings for each case category in a cluster to construct a case weight by the Median Method. Experience has shown that if the total FTE for a cluster is 40 FTE or greater, there will be sufficient sample size to construct a majority of the case weights by the Median Method.

In the Median Method, the median case weight of all the cluster case weights is chosen to represent the statewide case weight (see Table 6). For example, the median Misdemeanor case weight used to represent the statewide case weight comes from Cluster 7. By using the Median Method, courts of all sizes can represent the statewide case weight. The CWWL Work Group voted not to consider any possible effects on e-filing on the case weights at this time and

approved 13 of the 22 Missouri case weights calculated using the Median Method. They are (with their case weights in parenthesis):

- General Circuit Civil (373)
- Simple Circuit Civil (31)
- Domestic Relations (549)
- Protection Order (152)
- Associate Civil/Small Claims (139)
- Executions and Garnishments (36)
- Abuse & Neglect/Termination of Parental Rights (537)
- Circuit Felony (617)
- Associate Felony (202)
- Misdemeanor (203)
- Traffic (76)
- Mental Health Application (46)
- Treatment Court (459).

The CWWL Work Group also approved two other Circuit Civil case weights that have their roots in the General Circuit Civil case weight that was calculated by the Median Method. They are:

- Time Intensive Circuit Civil (746)
- Asbestos (3730)

When sample size is small, the Mean Method must be used to create the statewide case weight. For example, the juvenile case categories (e.g., Adoption, Juvenile Delinquency) are relatively rare. In the Mean Method, all minutes collected for a case category, irrespective of what court collected the minutes, are added together and statewide fractional filings are used to create the case weight. The Adoption case weight of 300 minutes was created by adding the total number of minutes reported by all 28 courts (18,661) and dividing by a fractional amount of the annual filings (based on the length on time study) for that case category (62) from all courts.

In the Mean Method, the largest courts can unduly influence the statewide case weight if they provide the majority of the time study minutes. All things being equal, the case weight

constructed by the Median Method is the recommended case weight to represent the statewide case weight. Both the Median and the Mean are “averages” but the Median is less affected by very low or very high values and that makes it a robust statistic. The CWWL Work Group approved the calculation of six case weights by a “hybrid” Mean Method that averaged the mean of all seven clusters with the mean of the six clusters of the Main Time Study Courts to inhibit the swamping effect of the Metro Court. The case weights (in parenthesis) calculated by the Mean Method are:

- Adoption (262)
- Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense (430)
- Decedent Estates (1560)
- Incapacitated/Minor Estates (1330)
- Simple Probate (182)
- Involuntary Detention Petition (78)

The penultimate case weight, Passport Issuance, was calculated by averaging the Passport values of the four courts in the Main Time Study who reported Passport activity.

- Passport Issuance (35)

There are sufficient sample sizes to construct a statewide Treatment Court case weight using the Median Method. Only the “clerical” activity codes (YC, YD, and YE) were used to construct the clerical Treatment Court case weight (70% of the reported Treatment Court minutes were YF). Treatment Court Time Study minutes were converted to annual minutes by multiplying the month-long time studies by a factor of 12 and multiplying the two-week time studies by a factor of 25. The denominator is the annual number of CY13 new admissions. There is a positive relationship between number of new admissions and the number of reported minutes ($r^2 = .63$, $p = 0.00$). The 18 counties that contributed data to the construction of the Treatment Court case weight were grouped into clusters based on their annual number of new admissions (total of all treatment courts in a county) to ensure reliable sample size (i.e., ≥ 35 new admissions). The clusters are:

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Count(ies)</i>	<i>CY13 Total New Admissions</i>
1	Jackson	399
2	City of St. Louis	215
3	Boone	183
4	St. Charles	149
5	Buchanan	82
6	Callaway, Wright	53
7	Douglas, Stoddard	43
8	Adair, Platte	35
9	Audrain, Barton, Cole, Lewis, Ozark, Vernon, Washington	43

The case weights for the nine clusters are shown on Table 6. The case weight calculated by the Median Method is 459 minutes and the case weight calculated by the Mean Method is 609 minutes. The CWWL Work Group approved the median case weight of 459 minutes as the statewide case weight.

Table 6. Calculation of 2014 Case Weights and Approved Statewide Weights

Case Category	Range of Cluster Case Weights (Case-Related + Non-Case-Related Minutes)	2014 Median	2014 Mean	Mean (Only Clusters 2-7)	APPROVED 2014 CASE WEIGHT	2011 CASE WEIGHT
GENERAL CIRCUIT CIVIL	208 (2) 233 (5) 366 (3) 373 (6) 564 (4) 589 (7) 686 (1)	373	446	368	373	324
TIME INTENSIVE CIRCUIT CIVIL	746 [373 * 2] or 798 [373 * 2.14]				746	648
ASBESTOS	3730 [373 * 10] or 3648 [373 * 9.78]				3730	3240
SIMPLE CIRCUIT CIVIL	15 (1) 16 (4) 18 (2) 31 (3) 59 (6) 60 (5) 69 (7)	31	28	34	31	35
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	465 (4) 518 (7) 538 (6) 549 (1) 583 (5) 596 (2) 625 (3)	549	557	560	549	512
PROTECTION ORDER	98 (2) 147 (6) 151 (7) 152 (3) 170 (4) 215 (5) 229 (1)	152	163	143	152	164
ASSOCIATE CIVIL/SMALL CLAIMS	100 (5) 128 (2) 136 (3) 139 (1) 156 (4) 171 (6) 187 (7)	139	140	141	139	122
EXECUTIONS & GARNISHMENTS	31 (2) 32 (5) 32 (5) 36 (3) 50 (6) 57 (7) 67 (1)	36	46	37	36	55
ABUSE & NEGLECT/TPR	521 (5) 537 (2) 1182 (1)	537	714	574	537	521
ADOPTION			300	224	262	348
JUVENILE DELINQUENCY			543	318	430	387
CIRCUIT FELONY	298 (3) 437 (5) 482 (4) 617 (2) 649 (6) 660 (7) 1178 (1)	617	639	541	617	515
ASSOCIATE FELONY	123 (6) 141 (4) 193 (7) 202 (2) 214 (5) 218 (3) 480 (1)	202	221	184	202	166
MISDEMEANOR	179 (2) 201 (5) 201 (5) 203 (1) 208 (7) 209 (6) 281 (3)	203	207	207	203	194
TRAFFIC	58 (4) 59 (7) 64 (6) 76 (3) 95 (5) 101 (2) 180 (1)	76	79	73	76	87
DECEDENT ESTATE			1721	1400	1560	1141
INCAPACITATED/MINOR ESTATE			1365	1294	1330	1012
SIMPLE PROBATE	127 (1) * 259 (2)	193	174	190	182	160
INVOLUNTARY DETENTION			91	65	78	120
APPLICATION 96 HOUR DETENTION	36 (3) 46 (2) 50 (1)	46	46	45	46	58
TREATMENT COURT	81 (3) 387 (5) 393 (7) 425 (6) 459 (4) 497 (8) 501 (1) 1322 (2) 1773 (9)	459	609		459	506
PASSPORT ISSUANCE			35	35	35	40

The number in () after the case weight is the cluster number. The smaller the number is, the larger the court. For example, (1) is Jackson County & (7) are the 14 courts with 4 or fewer FTE. *Black italics or an asterisk signifies the median.* Case weights in red are from e-filing courts. Treatment Court clusters are not the same as the other cluster numbers.

B. Annual Filings

The weighted workload is calculated by multiplying the individual case weights by their case categories' annual filings. In the CWWL, the last three years of original filings are averaged together to present a truer picture of the volume of cases going through the courts. This is important especially for the smaller courts that have wider swings in caseload because of their smaller volume of cases. It is also important for the less frequent case categories such as Juvenile Abuse and Neglect that have relatively larger case weights and the cases stay open for longer periods of time than other case categories. The original filings used for the new CWWL model are an average of the CY2011, CY2012, and CY2013 original filings. The exception is Treatment Court Admissions; here the admission count used in the model is either the average of the last three years or CY2013, whichever is larger. This is done so new and fast growing treatment courts are not penalized by lower counts in prior years.

C. Average Annual Availability (AAA or Clerk Year)

An important component of the CWWL Model is the "Clerk Year" or Average Annual Availability (AAA) – the amount of time in a year (a combination of the number of workdays and length of workday) a clerk is available to process the clerical workload. The AAA is calculated by subtracting weekends, state holidays, training days, annual leave (and other leave), and sick leave from 365 days. Information on non-work days during the time study is not used to determine the number of days in the AAA because annual information for annual and sick leave is available from the SAMII human resource computer.

Starting Point:	365	days in a year
minus	104	weekend days
minus	13	days State Holidays
minus	15	days Annual and Other Leave
minus	10	days Sick Leave
minus	5	days Training and Staff Development
leaves	218	workdays per FTE

Average Annual Availability = # workdays per FTE multiplied by the number of work minutes in a day.

State Holidays. The twelve Missouri State Holidays for 2014 are:

- New Year's Day January 1st
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Day January 20th
- Lincoln Day February 12th
- Washington's Birthday February 17th
- Truman Day May 8th
- Memorial Day May 26th
- Independence Day July 4th
- Labor Day September 1st
- Columbus Day October 13th
- Veteran's Day November 11th
- Thanksgiving Day November 27th
- Christmas Day December 25th

In two of the last four years, the day after Thanksgiving has been granted as a holiday to state workers by the governor. It is not necessary to add other non-work days, such as “snow days” to the list of non-work days because this time is already being credited under other types of leave. The CWWL Work Group approved 13 days of State Holiday credit (row 27 in the model).

Training and Staff Development. Training and Staff Development was a non-case-related activity collected during the Main and Metro Court Time Studies as in previous time studies. Travel to Jefferson City and other locations for training and conferences was reported under this category, not Work-Related Travel. The Main Time Study participants reported a total of 63,260 Training and Staff Development minutes during October and the Metro Court reported 24,060 minutes during its two-week time study (see Table 7).

Table 7. Time Study Training and Staff Development Minutes

County	Minutes Reported During Time Study	Estimated Annual Minutes	FTE
Caldwell	0	0	3.0000
Daviess	0	0	3.0000
Osage	0	0	3.2500
Wright	0	0	6.6750
Texas	20	225	6.9375
Adair	50	564	7.6000
Douglas	60	676	4.0000
Ralls	70	789	3.3000
Ozark	90	1,015	3.3000
Vernon	90	1,015	7.0000
Lewis	140	1,578	3.0000
Carter	180	2,029	3.0000
Howard	180	2,029	2.8000
Grundy	230	2,593	3.8000
Washington	380	4,284	8.0000
DeKalb	720	8,117	3.8000
Audrain	730	8,230	7.0000
Moniteau	1,330	14,994	3.3000
Callaway	1,540	17,362	12.5000
Bollinger	1,560	17,587	3.6250
Stoddard	2,900	32,694	13.0000
Barton	2,980	33,596	3.4500
Platte	4,090	46,110	23.0000
Cole	7,000	78,918	24.5750
Greene	7,730	87,148	83.0000
Scott	8,990	101,353	17.0000
Boone	22,100	249,154	42.0000
Jackson	24,060	597,022	196.8000

This is a much greater amount of Training and Staff Development minutes reported compared to 2011 (32,6530 minutes). It is not known how representative October (and November and December for the Metro Court) is for training and staff development. This is one reason the time study data for Training and Staff Development credit has not been used to calculate the Training and Staff Development for the workload model. The other reason the time study data has not been used is because there has been the idea that when the courts are busy and possibly understaffed, there is not time to do training and staff development beyond what is absolutely necessary. By building time for this into the model, there is a possibility staff can find time to do more training and development. The credit always has been determined by policy. Until the 2011 model, one day per quarter per FTE was credited. In 2011, due to the expansion of the JEWELS webinars, the CWWL Work Group decided to increase the days from four to five days. The CWWL Work Group also approved 5 days for Training and Staff Development in the 2014 CWWL Model (row 28).

Annual and Other Leave. Information on clerical Annual and Other Leave was obtained from the SAMII system for CY13. In past CWWL studies a COGNOS report was used to extract the Leave information from SAMII. Dr. Gottlieb requested the raw leave data from SAMII for CWWL14 to clarify how the COGNOS report was handling the “Other Leave” information. However, there is a possibility that the extraction of the SAMII information was not 100% successful because SAMII, the statewide human personnel database, is focused on money paid out to state employees for annual leave, sick leave, leave without pay, et cetera and not the actual number of days the employee was not at work. Table 8 (revised from the March 21st meeting to subtract compensatory time) shows the number of days of leave taken per FTE by county. However, there still is a question whether the data is over inclusive and contains duplicate leave information. The leave types grouped under “Annual and Other Leave” include annual Leave, Leave without Pay, and Other Leave without Pay – Admin Leave. Flex Time, Family Medical Leave, Military Leave, and Workers Compensation are included within these categories. The SAMII human resources database does not contain information on Circuit Clerk leave days so when calculating a per FTE statistic, the Circuit Clerk must be subtracted from the total authorized FTE in the CWWL model (two FTE subtracted for Marion County). In counties where the Circuit Clerk is also the Recorder of Deeds, 0.8 FTE, rather than 1 FTE, was

Table 8. Average “Annual Leave and Other Leave” Days Taken in 2013

County	Annual Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Douglas	27.56	4	3	9.19
Shelby	17.25	2.5	1.5	11.50
Clark	28.64	3.225	2.425	11.81
Benton	60.20	6	5	12.04
Texas	77.35	6.9375	5.9375	13.03
Ste Genevieve	75.44	6.5	5.5	13.72
Cass	311.83	23.675	22.675	13.75
Morgan	68.88	6	5	13.78
Laclede	166.84	12.95	11.95	13.96
Iron	35.68	3.5	2.5	14.27
Moniteau	35.81	3.3	2.5	14.32
Barry	159.31	11.8	11	14.48
Dade	27.63	2.875	1.875	14.74
Gasconade	59.38	4.8	4	14.85
Cooper	96.64	7.3	6.5	14.87
St Francois	299.29	21	20	14.96
St Clair	45.13	4	3	15.04
Warren	165.76	11.9625	10.9625	15.12
Worth	15.13	2	1	15.13
Pemiscot	137.13	10	9	15.24
Scott	243.84	17	16	15.24
Henry	122.06	9	8	15.26
Cole	360.86	24.575	23.575	15.31
Jefferson	804.40	53.5	52.5	15.32
Ozark	38.94	3.3	2.5	15.58
Greene	1279.00	83	82	15.60
Pulaski	220.76	14.8	14	15.77
Ray	97.80	7.175	6.175	15.84
Callaway	184.21	12.5	11.5	16.02
Andrew	92.19	6.75	5.75	16.03
St Louis City	2228.84	139	138	16.15
Ripley	78.20	5.825	4.825	16.21

County	Annual Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Crawford	155.61	10.6	9.6	16.21
Dallas	89.16	6.5	5.5	16.21
Caldwell	32.44	3	2	16.22
Grundy	49.08	3.8	3	16.36
Montgomery	65.67	5	4	16.42
Clay	828.65	51.325	50.325	16.47
Cape Girardeau	335.59	21.275	20.275	16.55
DeKalb	46.66	3.8	2.8	16.66
Gentry	25.06	2.3	1.5	16.71
St Louis County	4067.04	242	241	16.88
Linn	50.84	4	3	16.95
Boone	6 97.61	42	41	17.01
Carroll	32.06	2.675	1.875	17.10
Franklin	505.89	30.5	29.5	17.15
Stoddard	207.05	13	12	17.25
Butler	273.15	16.8	15.8	17.29
Stone	147.99	9.5	8.5	17.41
Howell	227.25	14	13	17.48
Buchanan	534.88	31.5	30.5	17.54
Nodaway	82.71	5.7	4.7	17.60
Dunklin	229.39	14	13	17.65
Osage	39.75	3.25	2.25	17.67
Webster	136.95	8.7	7.7	17.79
Adair	118.03	7.6	6.6	17.88
Howard	35.88	2.8	2	17.94
Scotland	35.97	3	2	17.99
McDonald	137.08	8.6	7.6	18.04
Monroe	27.16	2.5	1.5	18.11
Polk	145.00	9	8	18.13
Johnson	212.50	12.5625	11.5625	18.38
Christian	312.91	18	17	18.41
Bollinger	48.47	3.625	2.625	18.46
Cedar	64.73	4.5	3.5	18.49

County	Annual Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Macon	82.56	5.4375	4.4375	18.61
Jackson	3662.81	196.8	196.8	18.61
Saline	134.97	8.25	7.25	18.62
Clinton	93.13	5.8	5	18.63
Platte	410.88	23	22	18.68
Dent	105.13	6.6	5.6	18.77
Washington	131.56	8	7	18.79
Lafayette	226.37	13	12	18.86
Shannon	51.92	3.55	2.75	18.88
Wright	107.17	6.675	5.675	18.88
Miller	134.57	8	7	19.22
Audrain	116.00	7	6	19.33
Holt	29.06	2.3	1.5	19.37
Phelps	305.24	16.75	15.75	19.38
Taney	330.66	18	17	19.45
Harrison	78.05	4.7875	3.9875	19.57
Jasper	749.92	39.125	38.125	19.67
Mercer	49.19	3.3	2.5	19.68
Pettis	276.06	15	14	19.72
Barton	48.41	3.45	2.45	19.76
Daviess	39.63	3	2	19.82
St Charles	1324.32	67.6875	66.6875	19.86
Camden	248.40	13.5	12.5	19.87
Putnam	47.25	3.375	2.375	19.89
Livingston	95.87	5.7	4.7	20.40
Chariton	56.28	3.55	2.75	20.47
Lawrence	225.72	11.9375	10.9375	20.64
Newton	374.61	19	18	20.81
Pike	105.19	6	5	21.04
Schuyler	29.33	2.375	1.375	21.33
Vernon	128.01	7	6	21.34
Wayne	85.41	5	4	21.35
Hickory	53.69	3.5	2.5	21.48

County	Annual Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Knox	38.94	2.8125	1.8125	21.48
Randolph	203.61	10.375	9.375	21.72
Ralls	54.44	3.3	2.5	21.78
Bates	117.72	6.375	5.375	21.90
Marion	194.98	10.825	8.825	22.09
Oregon	44.64	3	2	22.32
Lincoln	348.27	16.5	15.5	22.47
New Madrid	159.26	8	7	22.75
Carter	45.69	3	2	22.85
Mississippi	173.83	8.5	7.5	23.18
Reynolds	50.88	3	2	25.44
Atchison	77.20	3.8	3	25.73
Madison	82.06	4.15	3.15	26.05
Lewis	53.50	3	2	26.75
Maries	54.88	2.8	2	27.44
Sullivan	42.16	2.5312	1.5312	27.53
Perry	144.22	5.75	4.75	30.36
				Mean = 17.54
				Median = 17.99

subtracted from the authorized FTE. The number of Annual Leave days taken ranges from 9.19 days per FTE in Douglas County to 30.36 days per FTE in Perry County. In 2013, the mean number of days of Annual Leave taken per FTE is 17.54 and the median number of days of Annual Leave taken is 17.99 (Scotland County). However, given there are questions whether the database these numbers were generated from is accurate, there was a recommendation made that 15 days of annual leave be credited in the CWWL14 Model because it is number of annual leave days credited for the past several CWWL and it is the lowest possible accrual (i.e., employees with fewer than 10 years of state employment). The CWWL Work Group approved 15 days of Annual Leave credit in the CWWL model for 2104 (Row 29). This is the same number of Annual Leave days credited in the 2011 CWWL model.

Sick Leave. Information on clerical Sick Leave also was extracted from the SAMII human resource database for CY13, but because the Sick Leave data is not paid out to the employee when he or she leaves state employment, the data could be used to calculate the number of clerical days lost to sick leave. The leave types grouped under “Sick Leave” include Sick Leave and Share Leave. The SAMII database does not contain information on Circuit Court Sick Days so when calculating a per FTE statistic, the Circuit Clerk must be subtracted from the total authorized FTE in the CWWL model (two FTE subtracted for Marion County). In counties where the Circuit Clerk is also the Recorder of Deeds, 0.8 FTE, rather than 1 FTE, was subtracted from the authorized FTE. The number of Sick Leave days taken ranges from zero days per FTE in Carroll County to 26.02 days per FTE in Oregon County. In 2013, the mean number of days of Sick Leave taken per FTE is 10.49 and the median number of days of Sick Leave taken is 10.14 (Table 9).

Table 9. Average “Sick Leave” Days Taken in 2013

County	Sick Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Carroll	0	2.675	1.875	0.00
Ralls	4.25	3.3	2.5	1.70
Dade	4.5	2.875	1.875	2.40
Ozark	6.25	3.3	2.5	2.50
Texas	26.88	6.9375	5.9375	4.53
Morgan	22.84	6	5	4.57
Randolph	45.41	10.375	9.375	4.84
Saline	37.35	8.25	7.25	5.15
Harrison	20.85	4.7875	3.9875	5.23
Madison	17	4.15	3.15	5.40
Montgomery	21.75	5	4	5.44
Cooper	35.78	7.3	6.5	5.50
Atchison	17.66	3.8	3	5.89
Stone	50.5	9.5	8.5	5.94
Howell	77.78	14	13	5.98
Iron	15.31	3.5	2.5	6.12
Shelby	9.44	2.5	1.5	6.29

County	Sick Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Daviess	12.63	3	2	6.32
Osage	14.63	3.25	2.25	6.50
Bates	35.31	6.375	5.375	6.57
Sullivan	10.38	2.5312	1.5312	6.78
Henry	55.23	9	8	6.90
Scott	111.16	17	16	6.95
St Clair	20.88	4	3	6.96
Boone	288.28	42	41	7.03
Wayne	29.22	5	4	7.31
Holt	11.38	2.3	1.5	7.59
Platte	167.66	23	22	7.62
Stoddard	92.91	13	12	7.74
Douglas	23.25	4	3	7.75
Moniteau	19.44	3.3	2.5	7.78
Schuyler	10.7	2.375	1.375	7.78
Ray	49.68	7.175	6.175	8.05
Grundy	25	3.8	3	8.33
Bollinger	21.89	3.625	2.625	8.34
Dent	47.17	6.6	5.6	8.42
Benton	42.2	6	5	8.44
Cass	193.08	23.675	22.675	8.52
Linn	25.8	4	3	8.60
Pulaski	120.55	14.8	14	8.61
Adair	57.82	7.6	6.6	8.76
Laclede	105.14	12.95	11.95	8.80
Lawrence	96.65	11.9375	10.9375	8.84
Vernon	53.81	7	6	8.97
Reynolds	18	3	2	9.00
Andrew	52.25	6.75	5.75	9.09
Greene	746.54	83	82	9.10
Cole	220.44	24.575	23.575	9.35
St Louis County	2272.95	242	241	9.43
Knox	17.13	2.8125	1.8125	9.45

County	Sick Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Cedar	33.85	4.5	3.5	9.67
Warren	107.93	11.9625	10.9625	9.85
DeKalb	27.65	3.8	2.8	9.88
Scotland	19.78	3	2	9.89
Clark	24.03	3.225	2.425	9.91
Clay	501.76	51.325	50.325	9.97
Perry	47.41	5.75	4.75	9.98
Gasconade	40.56	4.8	4	10.14
Dallas	56.13	6.5	5.5	10.21
Wright	58.19	6.675	5.675	10.25
Jackson	2069.45	196.8	196.8	10.52
Franklin	311.75	30.5	29.5	10.57
New Madrid	73.99	8	7	10.57
Camden	135.11	13.5	12.5	10.81
Buchanan	335.46	31.5	30.5	11.00
Ste Genevieve	60.81	6.5	5.5	11.06
Macon	49.18	5.4375	4.4375	11.08
Mercer	27.94	3.3	2.5	11.18
Johnson	129.31	12.5625	11.5625	11.18
St Louis City	1544.78	139	138	11.19
Callaway	129.95	12.5	11.5	11.30
Cape Girardeau	229.33	21.275	20.275	11.31
Christian	193.21	18	17	11.37
Putnam	27.27	3.375	2.375	11.48
Phelps	182.19	16.75	15.75	11.57
Crawford	113.25	10.6	9.6	11.80
Livingston	55.61	5.7	4.7	11.83
Barry	130.23	11.8	11	11.84
Marion	117.52	10.825	9.825	11.96
Pike	59.97	6	5	11.99
Ripley	57.94	5.825	4.825	12.01
Polk	96.31	9	8	12.04
Dunklin	158.34	14	13	12.18

County	Sick Minutes	Authorized FTE	Adjusted FTE	Average # Days/Year/FTE
Nodaway	57.58	5.7	4.7	12.25
Butler	195.03	16.8	15.8	12.34
Jasper	470.81	39.125	38.125	12.35
Clinton	61.75	5.8	5	12.35
Audrain	74.75	7	6	12.46
Jefferson	659.49	53.5	52.5	12.56
McDonald	95.51	8.6	7.6	12.57
Pettis	178.34	15	14	12.74
Monroe	19.22	2.5	1.5	12.81
Pemiscot	115.34	10	9	12.82
Hickory	32.5	3.5	2.5	13.00
Taney	222.68	18	17	13.10
St Charles	880.68	67.6875	66.6875	13.21
Worth	13.5	2	1	13.50
Caldwell	28.06	3	2	14.03
Newton	256.03	19	18	14.22
Lafayette	171.53	13	12	14.29
Howard	28.63	2.8	2	14.32
Chariton	39.5	3.55	2.75	14.36
Miller	101.35	8	7	14.48
Shannon	40.13	3.55	2.75	14.59
Barton	35.91	3.45	2.45	14.66
Gentry	23.25	2.3	1.5	15.50
Lincoln	243.15	16.5	15.5	15.69
Maries	33.19	2.8	2	16.60
St Francois	333.64	21	20	16.68
Washington	117.63	8	7	16.80
Webster	130.05	8.7	7.7	16.89
Carter	33.94	3	2	16.97
Lewis	35.63	3	2	17.82
Mississippi	181.03	8.5	7.5	24.14
Oregon	52.04	3	2	26.02

Mean = 10.49
Median = 10.14

Here the median is a good estimate of the central tendency. The number of Sick Days credited in the 2011 CWWL model was 10 days. The CWWL Work Group approved 10 Sick Days in the 2014 CWWL Model (row 30).

Length of Workday. Besides deciding how many days need to be deducted from the work year, the Average Annual Availability calculation also needs the average length of the work day, (i.e., the number of minutes available during the day to process the workload and other non-clerical related activities). Full-time equivalent (FTE) state employees in Missouri work an 8 hour, or 480-minute day. Not all the courts offer official breaks (usually 10 minutes in the morning and 10 minutes in the afternoon) – but some do, and all allow employees to break for restroom visits.

A “break code” has always been available in the CWWL time studies, but clerks in the earlier time studies appear to have been hesitant to use the break code if their clerk’s office did not have an official policy on breaks. In the CWWL time studies in 2002 and 2005 there was an Activity Code for Break (and Lunch and Leave), but there were never many Break minutes reported. In 2008, a decision was made not to enter the Break, Lunch, or Leave codes that were entered on the time sheet into the time study database to encourage time study participants to be more realistic in their reporting. In 2008, the Leave and Lunch codes were merged with the Break Code because of participant confusion what to code a short break around noon. In 2011, the Break code was labeled the “non-work” code. The 2008 and 2011 CWWL Models used two 10-minute breaks as the deduction from the 480-minute workday. In 2013, the CWWL Work Group increased the time lost to non-work to two 15-minute breaks as the deduction, resulting in a 450-minute workday. This was based on the misunderstanding that federal law mandated two 15-minute breaks and might be too large of a deduction given that some of the break time is included in the case weights given the “majority of the 10-minute” reporting guideline.

Because the objective of the time study is to capture all the time worked (rather than document time not worked), the non-work code is not entered into the database. Thus, there is no information from the Main or Metro time studies on how many minutes of non-work were reported. In the past, the CWWL Work Group has made a policy decision on how many minutes per person are lost during the work day from the 480 minute mandated work day, on average, to personal, non-work activity such as restroom breaks, trips to the vending machine, personal

phone calls, and chatting with a co-worker. Given that the overall reporting methodology may capture “break time” (i.e., code the 10-minute interval with what you did the majority of the ten minutes), the CWWL14 Work Group decided not to subtract any minutes from the work day for breaks and approved a 480 minute work day (row 25 in the model).

Final Estimate. The starting Average Annual Availability for the 2014 CWWL Model is 125,280 minutes a year (row 25 in the model). After deductions for State Holidays, Training & Staff Development, Annual & Other Leave, and Sick Leave; the Adjusted Average Annual Availability for the 2014 CWWL Model is 104,640 minutes (218 480-minute workdays) compared to 98,100 (218 450-minute workdays) in 2011.

D. Work-Related Travel Credit

Daily Travel Credit. The time study training manual gave examples of Work-Related Travel (not including commuting) as:

- To the post office or bank or court-related errands,
- To off-site storage facilities,
- To a second courthouse in your circuit,
- To off-site committee meetings,
- To prison/detention center for hearings, and
- To mental hospital for detention and 21-day hearings.

Time spent walking long distances within your building was not recorded during the time study as Work-Related Travel but as whatever case category or non-case-related activity it involved. Participants were instructed Work-Related Travel involved going outside. Travel to training or a conference was reported under Training and Staff Development. Daily Work-Related Travel is credited on a court, not individual, basis.

The following values were reported during the October (Main) and November and December (Metro) time studies (see Table 10). The time study minutes were converted to minutes/day/court. The range in the Main Time Study courts is from 0 minutes per day to 60 minutes per day per court. The Metro Court, which consists of several buildings in three locations, averages 373 minutes per day or approximately six hours. The mean for all courts is

32 minutes a day and the median is 16 minutes a day per court. The Work Group approved 16 minutes as the Daily Travel Credit per court; the credit in 2011 was 20 minutes (row 32).

Table 10. Time Study Work-Related Travel Times

County	Time Study Total Minutes	Minutes/Day/Court
Moniteau	0	0
Daviess	50	2
DeKalb	70	3
Texas	90	4
Howard	100	5
Scott	110	5
Adair	130	6
Vernon	160	7
Caldwell	190	9
Callaway	190	9
Stoddard	210	10
Lewis	220	10
Barton	250	11
Platte	310	14
Greene	400	18
Bollinger	470	21
Ralls	490	22
Grundy	510	23
Boone	530	24
Osage	530	24
Audrain	690	31
Washington	780	35
Carter	830	38
Ozark	830	38
Douglas	970	44
Wright	1070	49
Cole	1320	60
Jackson	3730	373

Two-Courthouse Travel Credit. There are three non-metro counties with two courthouses and one Circuit Clerk (Cape Girardeau, Jasper, and Randolph). These counties need to be credited with travel time above the daily travel time. Cape Girardeau verbally reported 13,500 minutes a year (4.5 round trips/week at 60 minutes each) for inter-courthouse travel time, Jasper verbally reported 45,000 minutes a year (14 round trip/week among six staff at 60 minutes each), and Randolph verbally reported 3,750 minutes a year (2.5 round trips/week) at 30 minutes each) for inter-courthouse travel time. In addition to the inter-courthouse travel, each courthouse also receives the daily travel time all courts receive to go to the bank or the post office. The CWWL14 Work Group approved the verbally reported two-courthouse minutes for Cape Girardeau, Jasper, and Randolph counties (row 32 in the model).

Note: These minutes are credited on a county basis. Metro courts that have multiple buildings receive their inter-building travel time below on a per FTE basis.

Intra- and Inter-Building Travel Credit for Large Courts. In the larger courts, and especially in the metro courts, there is travel time within the courthouse that takes time away from the workday and this should be deducted from the Average Annual Availability. For example, in Jackson County the main courthouse is 11 stories high and the elevators are often crowded – causing waits. Similar situations exist in the City of St. Louis and St. Louis County main courthouses. In addition, the metro courts have multiple court buildings. Jackson County has four court buildings in addition to the main building in downtown Kansas City: one is a half-hour away in Independence, one is fifteen minutes away in Kansas City, and two buildings are across a busy street. Several staff go daily to off-site storage facilities to retrieve files. The City of St. Louis has two courthouses across the street from one another as well as a storage area several blocks away and clerks go regularly to retrieve closed files. St. Louis County has the Justice Center across the street and clerks must go through the security lines with the public if they leave the building rather than walk across a bridge connecting the buildings.

Since 2005, the CWWL workload model has incorporated an “intra-building” travel time of 15 minutes per day per FTE for the metro courts (Jackson, City of St. Louis, and St. Louis County) and 5 minutes per day per FTE for the larger courts of St Charles, Greene, Jefferson, Clay, Boone, and Buchanan. These times were based on a reasonable estimate of the average amount of time lost per FTE per day. There was no intra-building time collected during the time

study. The annual credit per court in the 2011 model was 4.70 FTE for the City of St. Louis, 6.77 FTE for Jackson County, and 7.82 FTE for St Louis County. The CWWL Work Group approved 15 minutes of intra-building and inter-building credit for the metro courts and 5 minutes of intra-building credit for St Charles, Green, Jefferson, Clay, Boone, and Buchanan counties (row 32 in the model). This is the same as 2011.

E. Jury Management Credit

The data collected from the 28 courts in the time study was used in a bifurcated regression analysis with the sum of the annual Circuit Civil and Circuit Felony cases used as the independent variable to predict JMP time and the number of reported jury trials as the independent variable to predict JMT time. The use of regression analysis to predict the estimated JMP and JMT values for all 115 courts, not only the 28 in the jury management time study, emphasizes that courts do not receive “their own times back” in the model. Instead the individual courts in the time study contribute to the overall statewide values. In the case of jury management, there is not a Median or Mean calculated, instead a “sliding scale” value is calculated to credit courts based on the size of the Circuit Civil and Felony workload as well as the number of jury trials that occur (that includes “trial begun, no verdict” counts and “verdict returned” counts). Time spent scheduling and re-scheduling jury trials that settle before *voir dire* is captured in the case weights of the respective case categories.

JMP Calculations for the 115 courts: The number of reported JMP minutes was multiplied by a factor that would represent a year’s worth of activity, (e.g., minutes from a three-month jury term were multiplied by a factor of four to estimate a year’s worth of JMP activity). There is a strong relationship between the total number of FY13 Circuit Civil and Circuit Felony filings and the number of estimated annual minutes reported for JMP activity by the time study courts. The number of filings explains 81% of the variability ($r^2 = 0.814$, $df = 26$, $F = 113.45$, $p = 0.00$). The resulting regression equation, [estimated annual JMP minutes per court = (# Filings * 32.7380) + 4439.52], provides the JMP estimates for the 115 courts in Table 11.

JMT Calculations for the 115 courts: The number of jury trials that went at least as far as the *voir dire* stage is a good predictor of the number of minutes reported for the *voir dire* stage and beyond. The relationship explains 61% of the variability seen in JMT minutes reported during the time study ($r^2 = 0.597$, $df = 25$, $F = 37.03$, $p = 0.00$). The resulting regression

equation, [estimated JMT minutes per trial = (# jury trials * 497.643) + -137.20], provides the JMT estimates for the 115 courts in Table 11. There is more variability in JMT activity than JMP activity among the courts reflecting the fact that only some clerks take an active role in jury management after *voir dire*, while others have bailiffs who provide this stage of jury management. Time spent performing “courtroom clerk” activities during the jury trial, (e.g., making minute entries on trial events), are not considered jury management activities.

Table 11. Jury Management Credit

County	Reported JMP (in hrs/mo)	Estimated Annual JMP (in minutes)	Estimated Annual JMT (in minutes)	Total Estimated Annual Jury Management (in minutes)	Reported JM (in hrs/mo)	Estimated JM Credit (in hrs/mo)	JM Credit in 2011 CWWL Model
Adair	21.92	16,258	3,844	20,102	22.58	27.92	20
Andrew		8,826	1,356	10,182		14.14	13
Atchison		6,142	858	7,000		9.72	9
Audrain	27.48	16,651	5,337	21,988	29.08	30.54	18
Barry		21,954	1,356	23,310		32.38	24
Barton		7,353	360	7,714		10.71	10
Bates		13,082	1,853	14,936		20.74	13
Benton		12,067	2,351	14,418		20.03	17
Bollinger		9,088	858	9,946		13.81	12
Boone	144.92	55,216	16,783	71,999	171.67	100	101
Buchanan		49,651	14,294	63,945		88.81	78
Butler		26,669	5,337	32,005		44.45	33
Caldwell		9,285	2,351	11,636		16.16	13
Callaway		18,222	858	19,080		26.5	44
Camden		26,210	4,839	31,050		43.13	42
Cape Girardeau	32.03	35,213	8,820	44,034	34.42	61.16	66
Carroll		8,237	858	9,095		12.63	11
Carter	12.81	6,993	360	7,354	15.42	10.21	11

County	Reported JMP (in hrs/mo)	Estimated Annual JMP (in minutes)	Estimated Annual JMT (in minutes)	Total Estimated Annual Jury Management (in minutes)	Reported JM (in hrs/mo)	Estimated JM Credit (in hrs/mo)	JM Credit in 2011 CWWL Model
Cass		29,353	3,844	33,197		46.11	50
Cedar	16.76	10,169	2,351	12,520	24.5	17.39	10
Chariton		6,666	2,351	9,017		12.52	13
Christian		28,502	5,337	33,839		47	38
City of St Louis		200,606	158,611	359,217		498.91	624
Clark		7,713	360	8,074		11.21	10
Clay		52,139	25,243	77,381		107.47	108
Clinton		8,892	1,356	10,248		14.23	13
Cole	50.44	51,353	7,327	58,681	81	81.5	63
Cooper	8.01	13,934	360	14,294	10	19.85	15
Crawford	24.12	22,445	7,327	29,773	32.92	41.35	21
Dade		6,960	360	7,321		10.17	9
Dallas		10,856	1,853	12,710		17.65	18
Daviess	5.38	7,746	1,853	9,599	5.42	13.33	12
DeKalb	9.28	8,597	360	8,958	9.92	12.44	15
Dent		14,425	858	15,283		21.23	12
Douglas		10,070	2,351	12,421		17.25	19
Dunklin		27,749	1,356	29,105		40.42	33
Franklin		35,181	6,830	42,010		58.35	45
Gasconade		8,859	360	9,220		12.81	14
Gentry		5,585	858	6,443		8.95	9
Greene	166.33	123,082	30,717	153,799	180	213.61	177
Grundy		7,550	360	7,910		10.99	10
Harrison		8,368	858	9,226		12.81	12
Henry		17,109	1,853	18,962		26.34	19

County	Reported JMP (in hrs/mo)	Estimated Annual JMP (in minutes)	Estimated Annual JMT (in minutes)	Total Estimated Annual Jury Management (in minutes)	Reported JM (in hrs/mo)	Estimated JM Credit (in hrs/mo)	JM Credit in 2011 CWWL Model
Hickory		6,797	360	7,157		9.94	11
Holt		6,076	360	6,437		8.94	10
Howard		7,255	360	7,615		10.58	12
Howell		23,198	2,849	26,047		36.18	22
Iron		8,270	1,356	9,626		13.37	19
Jackson	505.58	219,037	64,556	283,594	636.17	393.88	492
Jasper		47,294	8,323	55,616		77.24	54
Jefferson		81,734	14,294	96,028		133.37	97
Johnson		27,684	1,853	29,537		41.02	27
Knox		5,225	360	5,586		7.76	8
Laclede		24,017	1,853	25,870		35.93	27
Lafayette		19,368	7,327	26,695		37.08	26
Lawrence		23,820	2,351	26,171		36.35	27
Lewis		7,942	858	8,801		12.22	10
Lincoln		24,672	5,337	30,008		41.68	47
Linn		8,008	2,351	10,359		14.39	15
Livingston		11,937	1,356	13,292		18.46	16
Macon		11,249	3,844	15,093		20.96	13
Madison		8,532	360	8,892		12.35	12
Maries		7,222	360	7,583		10.53	10
Marion		11,053	3,346	14,399		20	28
McDonald		12,428	1,853	14,281		19.83	20
Mercer		6,437	858	7,295		10.13	9
Miller		17,175	360	17,535		24.35	17
Mississippi		16,749	360	17,109		23.76	22
Moniteau		9,383	360	9,743		13.53	12

County	Reported JMP (in hrs/mo)	Estimated Annual JMP (in minutes)	Estimated Annual JMT (in minutes)	Total Estimated Annual Jury Management (in minutes)	Reported JM (in hrs/mo)	Estimated JM Credit (in hrs/mo)	JM Credit in 2011 CWWL Model
Monroe		6,797	858	7,655		10.63	11
Montgomery		10,234	4,839	15,073		20.93	21
Morgan		11,478	360	11,839		16.44	17
New Madrid		18,582	3,346	21,929		30.46	20
Newton		21,922	2,351	24,273		33.71	31
Nodaway		9,514	5,337	14,851		20.63	19
Oregon		7,648	360	8,008		11.12	10
Osage		7,222	360	7,583		10.53	11
Ozark		8,990	360	9,351		12.99	14
Pemiscot		19,204	360	19,565		27.17	18
Perry		11,871	858	12,729		17.68	15
Pettis		33,707	3,844	37,551		52.15	39
Phelps		38,160	6,332	44,492		61.79	45
Pike		11,380	2,351	13,731		19.07	21
Platte		31,154	6,830	37,984		52.76	52
Polk		14,064	1,356	15,420		21.42	17
Pulaski		28,207	2,849	31,056		43.13	31
Putnam		6,797	360	7,157		9.94	9
Ralls		8,434	360	8,794		12.21	12
Randolph		20,448	2,849	23,297		32.36	26
Ray		12,657	2,849	15,505		21.53	16
Reynolds		6,993	360	7,354		10.21	10
Ripley		11,675	858	12,533		17.41	11
Saline		15,145	4,342	19,486		27.06	15
Schuyler		5,487	360	5,848		8.12	9
Scotland		5,553	360	5,913		8.21	10

County	Reported JMP (in hrs/mo)	Estimated Annual JMP (in minutes)	Estimated Annual JMT (in minutes)	Total Estimated Annual Jury Management (in minutes)	Reported JM (in hrs/mo)	Estimated JM Credit (in hrs/mo)	JM Credit in 2011 CWWL Model
Scott		28,469	2,351	30,820		42.81	38
Shannon		7,517	858	8,375		11.63	10
Shelby		5,945	1,356	7,301		10.14	11
St Charles		92,374	27,233	119,607		166.12	159
St Clair		9,219	360	9,580		13.31	11
St Francois		40,189	5,835	46,024		63.92	34
St Louis County		343,638	82,969	426,607		592.51	402
Ste Genevieve		11,347	360	11,708		16.26	15
Stoddard		20,547	858	21,405		29.73	22
Stone		23,231	1,853	25,085		34.84	19
Sullivan		6,567	858	7,426		10.31	12
Taney		32,889	5,337	38,226		53.09	38
Texas		13,868	858	14,726		20.45	15
Vernon		13,606	360	13,967		19.4	15
Warren		20,547	3,844	24,391		33.88	25
Washington		13,999	858	14,857		20.63	30
Wayne		10,954	360	11,315		15.72	12
Webster		16,029	1,356	17,385		24.15	17
Worth		4,865	360	5,226		7.26	8
Wright		14,588	360	14,949		20.76	18

Mean = 42.24

Median = 20.45

Results. The 13 courts that did not report a jury trial reaching the *voir dire* stage in 2013 nevertheless received credit for JMT time for one jury trial per year (360 minutes).

The proposed 2014 jury management values are generally similar to the 2011 values for the smaller courts, greater than the 2011 values for medium sized courts, and smaller for two of the three metro courts. Differences from the 2011 model may reflect that for the 2014 model the option of using the number of trial days as a possible predictor was not done. In the 2011 CWWL model, the value used to predict the JMT value was the larger of either the estimated JMT value using the annual number of jury trials or the average number of jury days. An improvement in the 2014 model was the actual number of jury trials that reached *voir dire* during the jury management time study was reported by the clerks, rather than a fraction of the annual totals listed in the annual report.

The reason the JMP and JMT values were analyzed separately is many of the smaller courts spend large amounts of time preparing the jury pool and then jury trials do not occur. So, if jury management time is solely based on the number of jury trials, these small courts would receive no credit for the preparation of the jury pool. There still is a question, however, whether these small courts receive a sufficient amount of time for jury pool preparation because the regression equation is based on the number of filings. There is a minimum amount of time required to prepare a jury pool no matter how small the court. The twenty smallest courts receive JMP credit ranging from 6.76 hours a month for Worth County to 10 hours a month for Howard County. Is this sufficient time? A review of the ten courts in the jury management time study that reported the fewest number of jury management hours shows that average JMP monthly times ranged from 4.29 hours to 9.10 hours. These courts had jury terms of three, four, and six months. Of course the JMP workload is not the same every month, the majority of the work comes right before the start of a new jury term when the questionnaires are mailed out and reviewed, but a monthly average allows for comparison of courts with different jury terms lengths. Given that ten courts in the time study reported monthly averages of fewer than ten hours, it appears that the model does credit the smallest courts sufficiently for JMP time.

The 2014 CWWL Work Group was also presented with jury management results based on a jury term “weight” that was calculated using the Median Method where the clusters were courts with the same length of jury term. In an e-vote conducted after the March 20th meeting, the CWWL14 Work Group approved the jury management credit using the regression methodology for the 115 based on the values in Table 11.

F. Total FTE Clerical Resource Demand

The Total FTE Clerical Resource Demand is found in row 35 of the model. The weighted workload (row 34) or casework of the county, is the major part of the Total FTE Clerical Resource Demand, or clerical workload, but not the entire clerical workload. Travel (row 32) and Jury Management (row 33) must be added to the weighted workload to calculate the total clerical workload. The number of minutes required to perform these activities in rows 32 to 34 are converted to FTE (Full-Time Equivalent) by dividing the Travel, Jury Management, and Weighted Workload minutes by the Average Annual Availability (row 31).²

G. Authorized FTE Clerical Positions

Row 36 in the 2014 CWWL Model shows the number of state funded, non-statutory clerical positions per court for purposes of measuring resource demand and allocation of clerical resources. This also includes the county-paid and state-paid/reimbursed Circuit Clerk or similar position, at either 1.00 FTE or 0.8 FTE (if also Recorder of Deeds). Any other county-paid clerical resources, such as jury management staff, are not included in the authorized FTE clerical positions.

H. The Bottom Line

Row 37 in the 2014 Clerical Weighted Workload Model shows the bottom line, the difference between the authorized clerical resources a court has and the clerical resources a court needs according to the model. It is calculated by subtracting the court clerical workload supply (row 36) from the current clerical demand (row 35). A positive value in row 37 shows predicted clerical resource need for the court. A negative value in row 37 shows predicted clerical resource oversupply in the court.

The percent relative clerical demand shown in row 38 compares resource need across courts. It is the difference between demand and supply (row 37) divided by clerical supply (row 36). By using this value a smaller court that needs one clerk will show a relatively higher percentage of need than a larger court needing one clerk. The court with the greatest need is the court with the largest positive value.

² Conversely, to “back-calculate” the number of minutes credited to individual courts annually, multiply the FTE in the model by 104,640 the Adjusted Average Annual Availability. The estimate will not be exact because of rounding.

V. Dissemination of Report and Model after CCBC Approval

The CWWL14 Work Group at its last meeting discussed plans for the dissemination of the report and model after approval from the CCBC. It was decided:

- the 2014 CWWL Report and Model would be posted on the internal OSCA website,
- a webinar would be offered by OSCA staff to clerks across the state to explain the model and inform them of major changes from the 2011 CWWL Model,
- OSCA staff would be available to assist courts in using the model results by allocating workload by case category within their courts based on their current staffing,
- Dr. Gottlieb will make available individual court case weights to those courts that participated in the time studies so they can compare their times with the statewide case weights if they wish, and
- Dr. Gottlieb will make a presentation at Circuit Clerk Conference if the Circuit Clerk Conference desires and if she is available.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

The 2014 CWWL Study has several improvements compared to the 2011 Clerical Weighted Workload Study.

One, additional courts in the smallest clusters (clusters 6 and 7) allowed sufficient sample size to construct case weights by the Median Method for ALL clusters for 11 case categories.

Two, the aggregating of all treatment courts within a county resulted in larger sample sizes for Treatment Court case weights and a more statistically valid Treatment Court case weight.

Three, the use of “fraction of the year” filings rather than the filings that were entered during the time study period probably better reflects how cases are processed.

Four, a time study for Recorder of Deeds activity on a larger sample of courts with shared Circuit Clerk/Recorder of Deeds positions was conducted. Nineteen of the twenty courts with Recorder of Deeds shared positions participated.

Improvements made in earlier CWWL studies that were repeated successfully in the 2014 study are:

- The expansion of the Jury Management time study to encompass the entire jury term of 28 courts from the smallest to the largest to ensure all jury management activity was captured.
- The use of a bifurcated analysis to ensure the smallest courts with six-month jury terms received credit for their jury pool management work even if no jury trials occurred and also to ensure the largest courts that experience a greater number of jury trials received jury management credit for their jury trials.
- Updating of the Circuit Civil Time Intensive Case Type information that allows for the construction of a Circuit Civil Time Intensive case weight based on those case types that have the most docket entries and parties, and hence take more clerical time.
- Construction of a Super Time Intensive case weight for Asbestos cases that continue to be filed in the largest courts.

The 2014 CWWL Model is a useful tool, not only for assessing clerical resource need by county, but also for allocating resources within a court and for documenting emerging trends in the Missouri courts. Cluster 2 (Greene county) and Cluster 5 (Scott, Callaway, and Stoddard counties) implemented e-filing prior to the October 2013 Main time study and their relatively lower civil case weights (compared to the other clusters) suggest that when all courts are on e-filing and become more familiar with e-filing procedures, faster case processing may be able to be documented by the case weights.

The final draft of the 2014 CWWL Report and Model was distributed to the CWWL Work Group on April 3, 2014 and they recommended by e-vote on April 9, 2014 that the Circuit Court Budget Committee approve the 2014 Missouri CWWL Report and Model for use in determining clerical resource need over the next three years.

2014 Clerical Weighted Work Load Work Group
--

The Honorable Steven R. Ohmer, Co-Chair
Circuit Judge
22nd Judicial Circuit
Civil Courts Building, 10 N. Tucker Street
St. Louis, MO 63101
314-622-5606

Ms. Deana Aversman
Circuit Clerk
Lafayette County
PO Box 10
Lexington, MO 64067
660-259-6101

Ms. Cynthia Bowman
Circuit Clerk
Butler County
100 N. Main, 3rd Floor
Poplar Bluff, MO 63901
573-686-8082

The Honorable Gary Dial
Presiding Judge
1st Judicial Circuit
117 S. Market, Room 205
Memphis, MO 63555
660-465-7012

Ms. Stephanie Elkins
Circuit Clerk
Johnson County
101 W. Market Street
Warrensburg, MO 64093
660-422-7413

Ms. Linda Gundy
Court Clerk
Lincoln County
45 Business Park Drive
Troy, MO 63379
636-528-6300

The Honorable James Journey
Presiding Judge
27th Judicial Circuit
PO Box 487
Clinton, MO 64735
660-885-7242

The Honorable Patricia Joyce, Co-Chair
Presiding Judge
19th Judicial Circuit
301 East High Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101
573-634-9178

Ms. Beth Billington
Drug Court Administrator
Osage County
401 E. Main Street, Room 100C
Union, MO 63084
636-583-1550

The Honorable Glen Dietrich
Associate Circuit Judge
Nodaway County
303 N. Market
Maryville, MO 64468
660-582-2531

Mr. Jeffrey Eisenbeis
Court Administrator
Jackson County
415 E. 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64106
816-881-3658

Ms. Joan Gilmer
Circuit Clerk
St. Louis County
7900 Carondelet
Clayton, MO 63105
314-615-5252

Mr. Steve Helms
Circuit Clerk
Greene County
1010 Boonville
Springfield, MO 65802
417-868-4074

The Honorable John LePage
Associate Circuit Judge
McDonald County
PO Box 157
Pineville, MO 64856
417-223-4487

2014 Clerical Weighted Work Load Work Group

Ms. Becky Paulus
Circuit Clerk
Perry County
15 W. Ste. Marie Street, Suite 2
Perryville, MO 63775
573-547-6581

Ms. Susan Sadler
Circuit Clerk
Pettis County
415 South Ohio, Suite 324
Sedalia, MO 65301
660-826-5000

Ms. Beth Wyman
Court Clerk
Taney County
PO Box 335
Forsyth, MO 65653
417-546-7230

Consultant:

Karen Gottlieb, PhD, JD
PO Box 310
56 Forest Road
Nederland, CO 80466
(303) 258-7932
gottlieb@courtconsultant.com

OSCA Staff:

Sherri Paschal
Joseph Vradenburg
Becky Russell
Angie Plunkett
Mike Hancock
Paul Buckley
Cathy Zacharias
Laura Houts
Pierrette Bentivegna
KC Rafferty

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

Weighted Workload Calculations		Case Category	Weight	Adair	Andrew	Atchison	Audrain	Barry	Barton	Bates	Benton	Bollinger	Boone	Buchanan	Butler	Caldwell	
	1	General Circuit Civil	373	78	36	18	68	139	27	62	63	27	504	340	192	37	
	2	Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	4	1	0	4	1	1	2	0	1	24	13	9	0	
	3	Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	4	Simple Circuit Civil	31	339	270	86	409	619	219	292	389	182	2,881	2,088	951	154	
	5	Domestic Relations	549	177	435	41	185	448	106	181	161	111	1,287	859	581	98	
	6	Protection Order	152	147	79	24	254	379	162	182	117	92	1,348	783	624	50	
	7	Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	589	496	112	679	914	254	357	450	223	4,611	4,219	1,383	245	
	8	Garnishment and Execution	36	667	1,064	162	983	994	356	415	405	253	5,161	7,381	1,352	334	
	9	Adoption	262	10	4	2	10	29	9	10	5	8	67	35	33	5	
	10	Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	36	2	12	24	85	11	21	6	23	178	45	139	12	
	11	Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	15	12	3	15	10	14	10	3	9	202	100	50	12	
	12	Circuit Felony ¹	617	258	84	42	284	372	68	197	156	90	1,089	1,006	517	76	
	13	Associate Felony ¹	202	307	143	63	351	599	86	286	236	132	1,572	1,137	741	105	
	14	Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo ¹	203	625	280	141	623	750	151	614	560	238	3,269	1,742	1,180	278	
	15	Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord. ²	76	417	1,470	541	504	1,402	477	940	1,073	286	3,852	1,817	1,100	393	
	16	Decedent Estate	1560	13	12	11	23	39	13	16	24	11	82	60	40	3	
	17	Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	25	17	11	16	68	27	31	43	19	121	200	133	8	
	18	Simple Probate	182	50	24	26	62	74	25	38	49	16	198	179	67	21	
	19	Involuntary Detention Petition	78	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	279	74	58	0	
	20	Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	51	5	1	23	10	6	7	14	7	1,078	991	162	10	
	21	Treatment Court Admission	459	17	0	1	8	22	9	3	5	0	199	96	42	0	
	22	Passport Issuance	35	0	0	0	277	0	0	0	101	0	0	0	360	0	
	23	Total Filings/Admissions ³			3,825	4,435	1,297	4,802	6,954	2,021	3,765	3,759	1,728	28,002	23,165	9,714	1,841
	24	Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)			748,935	683,177	210,601	826,699	1,380,345	354,211	697,206	670,322	347,712	4,666,784	3,550,039	1,954,475	312,976
	AAA Calculations	25	Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
26		AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)															
27		13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	
28		5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	
29		15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	
30		10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	
31		AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	
Clerical Resource Calculations	32	FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.5025	0.3913	0.0379	0.0379	
	33	FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.1921	0.0973	0.0669	0.2101	0.2228	0.0737	0.1427	0.1378	0.0950	0.6881	0.6111	0.3059	0.1112	
	34	FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		7.1573	6.5288	2.0126	7.9004	13.1914	3.3850	6.6629	6.4060	3.3229	44.5985	33.9262	18.6781	2.9910	
	35	TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		7.3873	6.6641	2.1174	8.1485	13.4521	3.4967	6.8436	6.5817	3.4559	45.7890	34.9286	19.0219	3.1401	
	36	Authorized FTE Clerical Positions ⁴		7.6000	6.7500	3.8000	7.0000	11.8000	3.4500	6.3750	6.0000	3.6250	42.0000	31.5000	16.8000	3.0000	
	37	Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		-0.2127	-0.0859	-1.6826	1.1485	1.6521	0.0467	0.4686	0.5817	-0.1691	3.7890	3.4286	2.2219	0.1401	
	38	Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		-2.80%	-1.27%	-44.28%	16.41%	14.00%	1.35%	7.35%	9.69%	-4.66%	9.02%	10.88%	13.23%	4.67%	

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

		Case Category	Weight	Callaway	Camden	Cape Girardeau	Carroll	Carter	Cass	Cedar	Chariton	Christian	Clark	Clay	Clinton	Cole
Weighted Workload Calculations	1	General Circuit Civil	373	121	343	331	38	39	324	43	17	240	26	1,010	68	746
	2	Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	2	8	17	1	1	8	1	0	1	0	36	2	21
	3	Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	4	Simple Circuit Civil	31	717	1,034	1,678	174	137	1,980	193	120	1,664	95	4,728	349	3,907
	5	Domestic Relations	549	356	330	698	88	44	922	144	53	752	72	1,854	166	750
	6	Protection Order	152	452	487	813	70	93	682	164	35	413	112	1,494	100	973
	7	Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	1,107	1,161	2,862	218	156	2,756	289	144	2,118	103	10,079	695	1,929
	8	Garnishment and Execution	36	1,376	1,215	3,324	281	15	2,910	322	170	2,441	113	9,883	961	3,170
	9	Adoption	262	12	20	34	3	2	29	5	3	34	4	56	10	35
	10	Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	89	40	88	4	2	129	5	13	47	22	73	16	111
	11	Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	60	24	64	10	2	95	10	7	50	4	37	42	50
	12	Circuit Felony¹	617	317	370	568	51	35	513	145	53	418	74	656	87	604
	13	Associate Felony¹	202	454	500	804	69	78	535	210	56	512	83	994	188	727
	14	Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo¹	203	1,418	2,020	1,368	117	277	804	347	127	1,795	624	3,573	513	2,573
	15	Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord.²	76	1,664	1	1,135	355	1,920	5,198	307	249	869	130	4,227	962	1,322
	16	Decedent Estate	1560	25	43	46	12	5	58	9	14	36	14	132	16	47
	17	Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	46	45	98	18	10	77	25	9	67	8	182	22	78
	18	Simple Probate	182	81	84	150	49	11	163	28	19	107	25	356	28	152
	19	Involuntary Detention Petition	78	18	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	1	0	0
	20	Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	88	65	145	12	8	21	42	22	3	2	49	6	223
	21	Treatment Court Admission	459	26	0	45	0	0	39	6	6	17	12	16	0	32
	22	Passport Issuance	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	29	0	82	0	99	0
	23	Total Filings/Admissions³		8,429	7,790	14,268	1,570	2,835	17,247	2,406	1,146	11,584	1,605	39,437	4,330	17,450
	24	Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)		1,447,069	1,547,948	2,429,660	275,184	345,486	2,628,193	474,156	212,158	2,019,843	346,638	5,799,929	636,445	2,819,198
AAA Calculations	25	Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
	26	AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)														
	27	13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240
	28	5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	29	15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
	30	10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
	31	AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
Clerical Resource Calculations	32	FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.2049	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.6153	0.0379	0.0379
	33	FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.1823	0.2967	0.4208	0.0869	0.0703	0.3172	0.1196	0.0862	0.3234	0.0772	0.7395	0.0979	0.5608
	34	FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		13.8290	14.7931	23.2192	2.6298	3.3017	25.1165	4.5313	2.0275	19.3028	3.3127	55.4275	6.0822	26.9419
	35	TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		14.0493	15.1277	23.8449	2.7547	3.4099	25.4717	4.6889	2.1516	19.6641	3.4278	56.7822	6.2181	27.5406
	36	Authorized FTE Clerical Positions⁴		12.5000	13.5000	21.2750	2.6750	3.0000	23.6750	4.5000	3.5500	18.0000	3.2250	51.3250	5.8000	24.5750
	37	Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		1.5493	1.6277	2.5699	0.0797	0.4099	1.7967	0.1889	-1.3984	1.6641	0.2028	5.4572	0.4181	2.9656
	38	Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		12.39%	12.06%	12.08%	2.98%	13.66%	7.59%	4.20%	-39.39%	9.24%	6.29%	10.63%	7.21%	12.07%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

Weighted Workload Calculations	Case Category	Weight	Cooper	Crawford	Dade	Dallas	Daviness	DeKalb	Dent	Douglas	Dunklin	Franklin	Gasconade	Gentry	Greene
	1 General Circuit Civil	373	49	91	22	95	27	54	84	49	147	311	41	15	1,721
	2 Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	5	9	1	0	48
	3 Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4 Simple Circuit Civil	31	283	423	143	271	139	213	286	186	477	1,942	257	180	5,793
	5 Domestic Relations	549	150	277	55	171	64	82	166	134	474	954	122	55	2,836
	6 Protection Order	152	65	309	93	130	37	52	141	195	339	766	110	52	3,444
	7 Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	554	560	159	299	182	287	293	198	890	3,103	334	156	10,121
	8 Garnishment and Execution	36	707	575	198	369	278	440	372	141	992	3,477	371	320	10,797
	9 Adoption	262	7	14	3	10	3	2	7	5	19	67	5	4	201
	10 Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	16	30	4	15	7	12	13	23	90	154	13	9	610
	11 Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	13	14	1	8	16	21	5	8	57	52	8	2	125
	12 Circuit Felony ¹	617	244	449	52	105	91	83	236	126	573	688	94	22	1,941
	13 Associate Felony ¹	202	286	507	83	128	120	131	285	187	719	478	123	34	2,506
	14 Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo ¹	203	565	1,036	147	792	253	303	368	266	799	3,864	314	110	6,197
	15 Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord. ²	76	2,275	2,590	225	1,776	873	299	1,617	420	465	5,768	274	183	3,015
	16 Decedent Estate	1560	21	19	7	8	8	9	13	10	21	57	13	4	146
	17 Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	22	38	13	22	7	11	17	22	90	150	17	16	266
	18 Simple Probate	182	39	53	19	20	15	16	32	24	55	208	46	18	593
	19 Involuntary Detention Petition	78	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	53
	20 Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	16	164	5	3	7	2	43	13	82	57	3	5	530
	21 Treatment Court Admission	459	7	13	3	0	0	0	21	24	30	43	5	0	600
	22 Passport Issuance	35	165	79	49	0	0	0	0	0	64	0	0	0	0
	23 Total Filings/Admissions ³		5,484	7,249	1,281	4,223	2,127	2,018	4,001	2,031	6,390	22,148	2,151	1,185	51,543
	24 Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)		812,511	1,264,424	220,344	659,092	324,807	345,724	680,449	439,224	1,501,066	3,594,645	400,322	176,925	9,351,589
AAA Calculations	25 Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
	26 AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)														
	27 13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240
	28 5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	29 15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
	30 10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
	31 AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
Clerical Resource Calculations	32 FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.9688
	33 FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.1366	0.2845	0.0700	0.1215	0.0917	0.0856	0.1461	0.1187	0.2781	0.4015	0.0881	0.0616	1.4698
	34 FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		7.7648	12.0836	2.1057	6.2987	3.1040	3.3039	6.5028	4.1975	14.3450	34.3525	3.8257	1.6908	89.3692
	35 TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		7.9393	12.4060	2.2136	6.4580	3.2337	3.4275	6.6867	4.3541	14.6611	34.7919	3.9517	1.7903	91.8078
	36 Authorized FTE Clerical Positions ⁴		7.3000	10.6000	2.8750	6.5000	3.0000	3.8000	6.6000	4.0000	14.0000	30.5000	4.8000	2.3000	83.0000
	37 Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		0.6393	1.8060	-0.6614	-0.0420	0.2337	-0.3725	0.0867	0.3541	0.6611	4.2919	-0.8483	-0.5097	8.8078
	38 Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		8.76%	17.04%	-23.00%	-0.65%	7.79%	-9.80%	1.31%	8.85%	4.72%	14.07%	-17.67%	-22.16%	10.61%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

	Case Category	Weight	Grundy	Harrison	Henry	Hickory	Holt	Howard	Howell	Iron	Jackson	Jasper	Jefferson	Johnson	Knox
Weighted Workload Calculations	1 General Circuit Civil	373	27	27	98	33	17	30	146	32	3,270	489	1,212	337	16
	2 Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	2	0	4	0	1	0	2	0	131	21	14	6	0
	3 Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	0	0	0
	4 Simple Circuit Civil	31	132	123	468	194	92	172	632	148	20,504	2,462	4,245	829	62
	5 Domestic Relations	549	119	94	226	56	33	83	484	103	6,700	1,448	1,787	435	25
	6 Protection Order	152	203	116	230	59	37	55	468	95	6,905	1,422	2,401	215	23
	7 Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	177	274	671	141	142	210	934	238	30,706	3,726	6,896	871	69
	8 Garnishment and Execution	36	236	366	784	159	215	274	970	249	29,789	4,249	8,547	1,173	97
	9 Adoption	262	11	4	18	3	3	4	21	9	369	123	79	15	0
	10 Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	28	22	61	4	8	22	24	36	1,175	293	405	43	6
	11 Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	11	5	12	2	3	5	29	5	420	280	183	32	0
	12 Circuit Felony¹	617	83	94	294	50	31	62	445	79	3,387	848	1,123	322	18
	13 Associate Felony¹	202	121	140	377	65	38	81	612	124	4,082	1,766	1,477	382	29
	14 Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo¹	203	168	271	393	245	97	224	1,335	199	3,067	1,466	3,042	603	95
	15 Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord.²	76	408	964	1,708	89	584	264	2,012	324	3,801	3,776	4,725	2,638	105
	16 Decedent Estate	1560	9	7	28	11	4	8	31	6	391	97	124	33	7
	17 Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	21	26	62	15	6	15	77	11	586	188	258	37	4
	18 Simple Probate	182	21	35	51	18	19	20	91	18	1,293	188	282	63	15
	19 Involuntary Detention Petition	78	0	0	1	0	0	0	20	0	187	18	9	0	0
	20 Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	30	22	28	0	1	6	486	16	1,218	713	189	9	1
	21 Treatment Court Admission	459	15	7	4	0	1	0	9	7	427	17	46	0	0
	22 Passport Issuance	35	123	89	0	49	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	23 Total Filings/Admissions³		1,945	2,686	5,518	1,193	1,363	1,535	8,828	1,699	118,423	23,591	37,044	8,043	572
	24 Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)		366,716	423,161	982,969	229,732	177,676	281,013	1,625,485	323,424	18,702,754	4,212,159	6,109,524	1,342,754	104,661
AAA Calculations	25 Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
	26 AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)														
	27 13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240
	28 5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	29 15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
	30 10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
	31 AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
Clerical Resource Calculations	32 FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	5.6234	0.5059	0.6461	0.0379	0.0379
	33 FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.0756	0.0882	0.1812	0.0684	0.0615	0.0728	0.2489	0.0920	2.7102	0.5315	0.9177	0.2823	0.0534
	34 FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		3.5045	4.0440	9.3938	2.1955	1.6980	2.6855	15.5341	3.0908	178.7343	40.2538	58.3861	12.8321	1.0002
	35 TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		3.6181	4.1701	9.6129	2.3018	1.7974	2.7962	15.8209	3.2207	187.0678	41.2912	59.9499	13.1523	1.0915
	36 Authorized FTE Clerical Positions⁴		3.8000	4.7875	9.0000	3.5000	2.3000	2.8000	14.0000	3.5000	196.8000	39.1250	53.5000	12.5625	2.5000
	37 Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		-0.1819	-0.6174	0.6129	-1.1982	-0.5026	-0.0038	1.8209	-0.2793	-9.7322	2.1662	6.4499	0.5898	-1.4085
	38 Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		-4.79%	-12.90%	6.81%	-34.24%	-21.85%	-0.14%	13.01%	-7.98%	-4.95%	5.54%	12.06%	4.70%	-56.34%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

	Case Category	Weight	Laclede	Lafayette	Lawrence	Lewis	Lincoln	Linn	Livingston	Macon	Madison	Maries	Marion	McDonald	Mercer
Weighted Workload Calculations	1 General Circuit Civil	373	240	135	131	27	167	27	56	55	39	17	85	89	12
	2 Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	3	2	2	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	4	1	0
	3 Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4 Simple Circuit Civil	31	639	662	671	175	1,166	177	250	250	243	104	496	475	32
	5 Domestic Relations	549	436	317	412	70	449	117	154	129	107	66	293	226	28
	6 Protection Order	152	508	300	285	65	610	58	95	56	90	85	451	305	20
	7 Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	663	814	855	155	1,617	241	319	401	375	148	1,215	542	62
	8 Garnishment and Execution	36	1,092	891	1,202	185	1,750	354	370	472	380	153	1,518	681	67
	9 Adoption	262	30	14	22	5	16	7	4	6	5	3	13	30	2
	10 Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	67	28	102	15	85	34	9	30	32	11	48	51	3
	11 Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	27	19	11	10	33	27	20	23	10	5	26	31	2
	12 Circuit Felony ¹	617	363	356	421	70	472	80	157	146	110	62	176	175	37
	13 Associate Felony ¹	202	423	424	574	115	603	139	212	188	171	91	175	333	40
	14 Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo ¹	203	1,137	579	1,392	374	905	286	297	427	321	195	721	698	157
	15 Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord. ²	76	1,664	3,093	195	572	2,995	867	1,235	731	543	483	1,237	682	160
	16 Decedent Estate	1560	21	33	30	12	31	8	11	15	6	5	31	18	4
	17 Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	79	29	54	14	52	18	26	25	19	9	47	49	5
	18 Simple Probate	182	51	74	74	32	93	38	40	40	23	17	78	30	8
	19 Involuntary Detention Petition	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	20 Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	38	31	5	2	14	33	30	32	15	4	62	15	5
	21 Treatment Court Admission	459	0	23	17	5	35	19	0	3	7	0	9	24	4
	22 Passport Issuance	35	0	0	71	0	0	0	0	87	1	0	0	127	33
	23 Total Filings/Admissions ³		7,481	7,824	6,526	1,903	11,096	2,531	3,287	3,118	2,497	1,458	6,686	4,582	681
	24 Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)		1,430,617	1,237,504	1,383,756	337,041	1,767,206	422,261	555,502	549,512	434,699	249,619	1,059,813	851,161	130,412
AAA Calculations	25 Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
	26 AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)														
	27 13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240
	28 5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	29 15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
	30 10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
	31 AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
	32 FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0758	0.0379	0.0379
Clerical Resource Calculations	33 FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.2472	0.2551	0.2501	0.0841	0.2868	0.0990	0.1270	0.1442	0.0850	0.0725	0.1376	0.1365	0.0697
	34 FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		13.6718	11.8263	13.2240	3.2210	16.8884	4.0354	5.3087	5.2515	4.1542	2.3855	10.1282	8.1342	1.2463
	35 TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		13.9569	12.1193	13.5120	3.3430	17.2131	4.1723	5.4736	5.4336	4.2771	2.4959	10.3416	8.3086	1.3539
	36 Authorized FTE Clerical Positions ⁴		12.9500	13.0000	11.9375	3.0000	16.5000	4.0000	5.7000	5.4375	4.1500	2.8000	10.8250	8.6000	3.3000
	37 Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		1.0069	-0.8807	1.5745	0.3430	0.7131	0.1723	-0.2264	-0.0039	0.1271	-0.3041	-0.4834	-0.2914	-1.9461
	38 Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		7.78%	-6.77%	13.19%	11.43%	4.32%	4.31%	-3.97%	-0.07%	3.06%	-10.86%	-4.47%	-3.39%	-58.97%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

Weighted Workload Calculations	Case Category	Weight	Miller	Mississippi	Moniteau	Monroe	Montgomery	Morgan	New Madrid	Newton	Nodaway	Oregon	Osage	Ozark	Pemiscot
	1 General Circuit Civil	373	117	69	41	29	48	81	85	185	49	37	21	60	108
	2 Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	4	1	1	0	1	2
	3 Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4 Simple Circuit Civil	31	633	376	182	131	258	380	353	986	249	137	160	170	421
	5 Domestic Relations	549	276	198	106	64	109	146	222	475	140	91	76	66	275
	6 Protection Order	152	256	200	72	58	108	50	172	416	105	118	135	102	327
	7 Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	473	424	265	181	294	399	419	1,635	400	176	195	133	583
	8 Garnishment and Execution	36	709	657	285	235	334	517	564	1,755	519	159	177	127	750
	9 Adoption	262	17	4	5	5	5	8	5	55	9	5	2	1	9
	10 Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	29	33	7	11	21	16	39	184	63	7	3	12	50
	11 Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	21	44	2	8	5	13	21	78	10	6	2	4	16
	12 Circuit Felony ¹	617	287	272	90	45	121	157	360	320	142	81	48	78	405
	13 Associate Felony ¹	202	411	382	132	52	162	246	399	677	178	117	70	111	488
	14 Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo ¹	203	533	521	336	152	334	380	855	2,340	329	257	315	238	839
	15 Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord. ²	76	1,218	1,069	371	343	1,177	613	900	1,390	855	437	673	380	1,418
	16 Decedent Estate	1560	18	11	8	9	11	21	19	43	23	12	15	9	17
	17 Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	41	37	15	11	13	21	38	100	28	16	18	14	28
	18 Simple Probate	182	54	31	24	26	31	48	29	104	38	23	21	27	30
	19 Involuntary Detention Petition	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	32	0	0	0	0
	20 Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	22	16	9	7	12	24	24	895	154	21	7	8	19
	21 Treatment Court Admission	459	0	8	0	0	3	0	5	40	6	0	7	6	0
	22 Passport Issuance	35	0	19	0	0	0	145	65	125	0	0	0	0	58
	23 Total Filings/Admissions ³		5,117	4,372	1,951	1,368	3,047	3,265	4,574	11,978	3,330	1,701	1,945	1,547	5,843
	24 Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)		929,838	806,598	359,653	232,769	477,188	565,992	936,313	2,074,870	582,042	328,672	325,055	300,057	1,098,301
AAA Calculations	25 Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
	26 AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)														
	27 13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240
	28 5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	29 15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
	30 10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
	31 AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
Clerical Resource Calculations	32 FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379
	33 FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.1676	0.1635	0.0931	0.0732	0.1440	0.1131	0.2096	0.2320	0.1419	0.0765	0.0725	0.0894	0.1870
	34 FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		8.8861	7.7083	3.4371	2.2245	4.5603	5.4089	8.9479	19.8287	5.5623	3.1410	3.1064	2.8675	10.4960
	35 TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		9.0916	7.9097	3.5681	2.3356	4.7422	5.5600	9.1954	20.0985	5.7422	3.2554	3.2168	2.9948	10.7209
	36 Authorized FTE Clerical Positions ⁴		8.0000	8.5000	3.0000	2.5000	5.0000	5.6000	8.0000	19.0000	5.7000	3.0000	3.2500	3.0000	10.0000
	37 Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		1.0916	-0.5903	0.2681	-0.1644	-0.2578	-0.0400	1.1954	1.0985	0.0422	0.2554	-0.0332	-0.3052	0.7209
	38 Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		13.64%	-6.94%	8.12%	-6.58%	-5.16%	-0.71%	14.94%	5.78%	0.74%	8.51%	-1.02%	-9.25%	7.21%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

	Case Category	Weight	Perry	Pettis	Phelps	Pike	Platte	Polk	Pulaski	Putnam	Ralls	Randolph	Ray	Reynolds	Ripley
Weighted Workload Calculations	1 General Circuit Civil	373	47	412	400	71	418	94	125	19	26	126	85	22	61
	2 Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	1	4	7	1	6	2	1	0	1	5	1	0	2
	3 Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4 Simple Circuit Civil	31	250	817	780	305	1,935	614	719	103	124	791	356	131	305
	5 Domestic Relations	549	151	453	470	156	609	295	629	46	75	276	206	61	182
	6 Protection Order	152	114	411	439	143	612	247	804	33	104	175	283	61	170
	7 Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	385	1,437	853	420	2,785	623	887	109	197	951	768	111	299
	8 Garnishment and Execution	36	503	2,016	1,020	601	2,681	732	865	105	285	1,341	1,011	94	259
	9 Adoption	262	7	18	24	8	20	12	40	4	5	15	9	2	10
	10 Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	16	58	59	38	32	25	66	17	10	63	8	14	46
	11 Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	12	22	24	11	39	11	29	6	5	22	15	1	18
	12 Circuit Felony¹	617	206	440	673	157	347	248	500	49	74	339	163	58	145
	13 Associate Felony¹	202	247	572	676	171	488	344	706	66	90	422	218	79	262
	14 Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo¹	203	434	779	1,996	210	2,826	338	943	173	177	521	247	380	613
	15 Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord.²	76	764	1,267	3,049	742	3,560	2,397	2,036	363	810	1,425	918	1	554
	16 Decedent Estate	1560	19	33	32	17	49	17	32	10	15	17	22	4	11
	17 Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	28	69	63	20	107	45	79	9	13	29	39	7	44
	18 Simple Probate	182	39	76	66	43	140	52	49	18	25	50	51	16	18
	19 Involuntary Detention Petition	78	0	0	7	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	20 Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	27	93	230	7	20	185	32	22	4	101	29	2	17
	21 Treatment Court Admission	459	1	8	10	0	24	10	23	5	0	16	20	6	8
	22 Passport Issuance	35	0	0	0	191	0	0	987	40	0	0	0	68	62
	23 Total Filings/Admissions³		3,251	8,985	10,878	3,312	16,698	6,299	9,552	1,197	2,040	6,685	4,449	1,118	3,086
	24 Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)		612,304	1,617,282	2,057,081	549,698	2,583,644	972,183	1,757,773	214,063	324,497	1,075,709	726,351	234,961	639,917
AAA Calculations	25 Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
	26 AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)														
	27 13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240
	28 5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	29 15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
	30 10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
	31 AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
Clerical Resource Calculations	32 FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.1117	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379
	33 FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.1216	0.3589	0.4252	0.1312	0.3630	0.1474	0.2968	0.0684	0.0840	0.2226	0.1482	0.0703	0.1198
	34 FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		5.8515	15.4557	19.6586	5.2532	24.6908	9.2907	16.7983	2.0457	3.1011	10.2801	6.9414	2.2454	6.1154
	35 TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		6.0111	15.8525	20.1218	5.4224	25.0917	9.4760	17.1330	2.1520	3.2230	10.6144	7.1275	2.3536	6.2731
	36 Authorized FTE Clerical Positions⁴		5.7500	15.0000	16.7500	6.0000	23.0000	9.0000	14.8000	3.3750	3.3000	10.3750	7.1750	2.5000	5.8250
	37 Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		0.2611	0.8525	3.3718	-0.5776	2.0917	0.4760	2.3330	-1.2230	-0.0770	0.2394	-0.0475	-0.1464	0.4481
	38 Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		4.54%	5.68%	20.13%	-9.63%	9.09%	5.29%	15.76%	-36.24%	-2.33%	2.31%	-0.66%	-5.86%	7.69%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

Weighted Workload Calculations		Case Category	Weight	Saline	Schuyler	Scotland	Scott	Shannon	Shelby	St. Charles	St. Clair	St. Francois	City of St. Louis	St. Louis County	Ste. Genevieve	Stoddard
	1	General Circuit Civil	373	83	16	15	152	31	16	1,252	34	244	4,156	4,889	74	154
	2	Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	3	0	0	5	1	0	29	1	9	93	189	2	1
	3	Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	1	0	0
	4	Simple Circuit Civil	31	358	65	61	1,101	100	75	7,409	162	1,120	19,549	24,318	208	610
	5	Domestic Relations	549	203	43	38	521	47	56	2,528	94	812	3,005	8,177	133	381
	6	Protection Order	152	178	26	26	391	120	44	2,022	108	599	3,581	5,654	90	354
	7	Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	624	93	66	1,524	135	122	9,600	186	2,105	19,434	46,264	541	816
	8	Garnishment and Execution	36	1,061	93	73	2,356	151	140	10,107	181	2,193	22,904	58,476	562	972
	9	Adoption	262	10	1	2	18	2	7	77	9	42	65	253	6	30
	10	Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	22	10	11	65	2	21	176	14	92	310	668	11	203
	11	Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	16	4	5	149	3	6	169	2	48	323	434	15	72
	12	Circuit Felony ¹	617	253	15	37	602	55	33	1,386	83	801	3,680	5,111	155	296
	13	Associate Felony ¹	202	284	33	39	824	119	43	1,663	124	1,061	4,061	5,931	233	556
	14	Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo ¹	203	559	153	154	901	404	194	4,620	344	1,205	2,330	10,147	609	1,327
	15	Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord. ²	76	1,116	514	209	817	1,249	300	7,751	1,215	1,971	44	13,793	2,327	657
	16	Decedent Estate	1560	17	7	7	22	6	9	186	14	42	189	862	12	18
	17	Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	31	8	6	114	13	9	226	24	92	199	479	29	65
	18	Simple Probate	182	54	13	25	75	17	26	626	23	134	529	2,336	45	46
	19	Involuntary Detention Petition	78	4	0	0	48	0	0	16	0	11	315	142	0	0
	20	Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	32	3	2	71	4	4	179	17	193	981	1,497	14	45
	21	Treatment Court Admission	459	8	0	4	34	0	0	167	3	9	242	150	9	20
	22	Passport Issuance	35	319	0	69	408	0	74	0	57	195	0	0	0	0
	23	Total Filings/Admissions ³			5,235	1,097	849	10,198	2,459	1,179	50,189	2,695	12,978	86,146	189,771	5,075
24	Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)			835,005	169,277	158,329	1,859,724	351,378	208,159	7,807,964	430,109	2,457,783	13,253,560	27,233,602	745,034	1,384,731
AAA Calculations	25	Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280
	26	AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)														
	27	13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240
	28	5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	29	15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
	30	10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
	31	AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
Clerical Resource Calculations	32	FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.8152	0.0379	0.0379	3.9960	8.1710	0.0379	0.0379
	33	FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.1862	0.0559	0.0565	0.2945	0.0800	0.0698	1.1430	0.0916	0.4398	1.9171	4.0769	0.1119	0.2046
	34	FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		7.9798	1.6177	1.5131	17.7726	3.3580	1.9893	74.6174	4.1104	23.4880	126.6586	260.2600	7.1200	13.2333
	35	TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		8.2039	1.7115	1.6075	18.1050	3.4759	2.0970	76.5756	4.2398	23.9657	132.5717	272.5079	7.2698	13.4758
	36	Authorized FTE Clerical Positions ⁴		8.2500	2.3750	3.0000	17.0000	3.5500	2.5000	67.6875	4.0000	21.0000	139.0000	242.0000	6.5000	13.0000
	37	Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		-0.0461	-0.6635	-1.3925	1.1050	-0.0741	-0.4030	8.8881	0.2398	2.9657	-6.4283	30.5079	0.7698	0.4758
	38	Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		-0.56%	-27.94%	-46.42%	6.50%	-2.09%	-16.12%	13.13%	6.00%	14.12%	-4.62%	12.61%	11.84%	3.66%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

THE OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR
FY 15 - CCBC Clerical Weighted Workload Model
Approved by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on April 18, 2014

Missouri Clerical Weighted Workload Model - All Courts -
Average of CY11, CY12, and CY13 Filings

Weighted Workload Calculations	Case Category	Weight	Stone	Sullivan	Taney	Texas	Vernon	Warren	Washington	Wayne	Webster	Worth	Wright	Statewide
	1 General Circuit Civil	373	343	19	326	92	71	102	118	48	89	4	118	29,739
	2 Time Intensive Circuit Civil/Sex. Predator	746	3	0	7	3	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	825
	3 Asbestos	3730	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174
	4 Simple Circuit Civil	31	761	118	1,714	344	477	624	377	189	588	33	364	144,042
	5 Domestic Relations	549	246	61	557	211	209	263	273	150	298	83	206	55,284
	6 Protection Order	152	117	43	323	279	227	326	219	104	220	23	193	52,001
	7 Associate Civil/Small Claims	139	614	165	2,003	443	513	933	690	262	847	31	310	211,470
	8 Garnishment and Execution	36	824	169	1,953	304	666	849	717	238	940	51	354	245,603
	9 Adoption	262	19	2	29	20	13	12	19	5	16	0	12	2,610
	10 Abuse and Neglect/Term. Parent. Rights	537	48	12	118	31	20	45	67	20	27	4	47	7,842
	11 Juvenile Delinquency/Status Offense	430	7	17	30	11	17	6	13	4	10	2	22	4,301
	12 Circuit Felony ¹	617	235	43	548	223	194	358	213	127	253	7	217	43,025
	13 Associate Felony ¹	202	386	77	770	228	335	410	338	236	360	8	257	55,479
	14 Misdemeanor/Muni.Cert./Trial de Novo ¹	203	920	113	2,285	488	698	642	338	503	625	27	287	106,654
	15 Traffic/WC/Conservation/Muni.Ord. ²	76	763	798	326	966	395	2,274	652	1,407	1,562	62	1,011	159,155
	16 Decedent Estate	1560	32	8	39	17	19	17	15	12	18	3	10	4,196
	17 Incapacitated/Minor Estate	1330	34	7	45	43	49	28	34	23	36	5	32	6,390
	18 Simple Probate	182	57	13	127	30	49	44	36	35	42	8	29	11,480
	19 Involuntary Detention Petition	78	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,514
	20 Application for 96 Hour Detention	46	2	17	17	17	7	15	26	17	5	0	22	12,160
	21 Treatment Court Admission	459	52	17	14	7	10	15	9	12	8	0	31	3,053
	22 Passport Issuance	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	170	0	0	5,102
	23 Total Filings/Admissions ³		5,463	1,699	11,231	3,757	3,981	6,965	4,155	3,432	6,115	351	3,522	1,162,099
	24 Weighted Workload (Sum of Weights x Filings)		1,052,569	252,480	2,100,731	753,895	777,248	1,129,160	806,243	579,119	991,641	89,645	690,984	190,948,823
AAA Calculations	25 Average Annual Availability (AAA) (480 minutes)		125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	125,280	
	26 AAA Adjustments per Clerk (In minutes)													
	27 13 days State Holidays Credit		6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	6,240	
	28 5 days Training and Development Credit		2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	
	29 15 days Annual and Other Leave Credit		7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	
	30 10 days Sick Leave Credit		4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	
	31 AAA for Weighted Workload		104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640	104,640
	32 FTE Clerical Travel Demand		0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	0.0379	26.4958
Clerical Resource Calculations	33 FTE Clerical Jury Management Demand		0.2397	0.0710	0.3653	0.1407	0.1335	0.2331	0.1420	0.1081	0.1661	0.0499	0.1429	31.9067
	34 FTE Clerical Case Weighted Workload Demand		10.0590	2.4128	20.0758	7.2047	7.4278	10.7909	7.7049	5.5344	9.4767	0.8567	6.6034	1,824.8167
	35 TOTAL FTE Clerical Resource Demand		10.3366	2.5217	20.4790	7.3833	7.5992	11.0619	7.8848	5.6804	9.6808	0.9446	6.7842	1883.2192
	36 Authorized FTE Clerical Positions ⁴		9.5000	2.5312	18.0000	6.9375	7.0000	11.9625	8.0000	5.0000	8.7000	2.0000	6.6750	1,791.1187
	37 Clerical Demand exceeds Authorized FTE by		0.8366	-0.0095	2.4790	0.4458	0.5992	-0.9006	-0.1152	0.6804	0.9808	-1.0554	0.1092	92.1005
	38 Percent that Demand exceeds Authorized FTE		8.81%	-0.37%	13.77%	6.43%	8.56%	-7.53%	-1.44%	13.61%	11.27%	-52.77%	1.64%	5.14%

NOTES:

1. The CWWL filings were adjusted by deducting filings for consecutively numbered associate felony, circuit felony and/or misdemeanor cases filed on the same day for a single defendant. Exact adjustments are shown on Detail of Adjustments to CWWL for FY15 Budget. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on December 12, 2003.

2. The CWWL filings were proportionally reduced for counties not using the FCC continuously from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. For all courts using the FCC during this time, OSCA staff calculated an average of the traffic cases that were disposed with a guilty plea at the Fine Collection Center and were not processed by the county. This percentage (53.4%) was used to proportionally reduce traffic filings for calendar year 2011 for all other counties not using the FCC. There were no reductions for calendar years 2012 and 2013 since all counties used the FCC for the entire year. This was a decision made by the CCBC on December 12, 2003.

3. Filings data are the average of CY11, CY12 and CY13 CWWL original filings.

4. Some counties have a Circuit Clerk ex officio Recorder of Deeds (one person holds both offices). The circuit clerk position is counted as 0.8 FTE in these counties. This was a decision made by the Circuit Court Budget Committee on June 10, 2011.

**Time Study Results for Missouri Circuit Courts
where the Circuit Clerk is also the Recorder of Deeds**

Final Draft

April 3, 2014

Karen Gottlieb, PhD JD
Court Consultant
gottlieb@courtconsultant.com

Background

The 2014 Clerical Weighted Workload Study (CWWL14) Request for Proposals asked that the CWWL methodology address the Recorder of Deeds workload in the 20 courts where the Circuit Clerk and Recorder of Deeds positions are held by the same person. The reason behind the request is the Circuit Court Budget Committee (CCBC) adjusts the authorized FTE value in the CWWL workload model to account for time spent by the Circuit Clerk on Recorder of Deeds activities, as this time is not available for the Circuit Clerk to work on Circuit Court activities. Although past time studies always had a code for Recorder of Deeds activities, this data was not analyzed as part of the clerical workload.

Previous to 2011, the dual position adjustment approved by the CCBC was 0.5 FTE. Based upon OSCA's *ad hoc* analysis of Recorder of Deeds minutes reported by five counties during the 2010 Main Time Study, the CCBC adjusted the value of the dual position to 0.2 FTE, giving the Circuit Clerk 80% credit for Circuit Court work and 20% credit for Recorder of Deeds work. Assuming a 450-minute workday, that is 360 minutes for Circuit Court and 90 minutes for Recorder of Deeds activity.

Methodology

Because the OSCA's *ad hoc* analysis was based on only five counties, a larger Recorder of Deeds study was conducted in 2013. All but one of the 20 courts that had Circuit Clerks who also were Recorder of Deeds participated in a month-long time study in October.¹ The Circuit Clerk was interviewed to obtain information on the number of split Deputy Recorder/Deputy Circuit Clerk positions, the number of Deputy Recorder positions, and if any of the Circuit Clerk staff assisted in Recorder of Deeds activity. The time sheet used during the Recorder of Deeds Time Study was a weekly time sheet where court staff (i.e., Circuit Clerk, Deputy Clerk, etc.) only reported the number of minutes spent on Recorder of Deed activity (See Appendix).² Minutes reported by county-paid Deputy Recorders and Deputy Recorders/Circuit Clerk split positions were not included in the analysis.

¹The Circuit Clerk of the non-participating court had recently resigned.

² Five of the courts (Grundy, Howard, Moniteau, Ozark, and Ralls) also were in the Main Time Study so they reported their Recorder of Deeds minutes as part of the daily reporting.

Results

All 19 courts reported Recorder of Deeds activity in October for a total of 26,392 minutes (See Table 1). Eighteen Circuit Clerks contributed 17,064 minutes (65% of the total) and 25 Deputy (Circuit) Clerks contributed 9,328 minutes (35%). Reported activities included:

- Recording deeds
- Searching deeds
- Copying deeds
- Answering questions on phone
- Searching plats
- Sorting and opening mail
- Receipting money
- Handling marriage license applications
- Certifying marriage licenses
- Copying marriage licenses
- Processing end of month checks
- Looking up DOR tax liens
- Contacting title companies
- Contacting Tapestry support line
- Researching for genealogy.

There are 22 workdays in October. Each court's October time study minutes were divided by 22 to obtain a 'minutes per day' estimate for Recorder of Deeds activity performed by court staff. The number of minutes per day spent on Recorder of Deeds activity by court staff ranged from 2 minutes/day (Moniteau County) to 363 minutes per day (Pulaski County - a relatively large court with 14.8 clerical FTE) (See Table 2). **The court with the median value is Ralls at 35 minutes and the mean value for all 19 courts is 63 minutes.**

Table 1. Recorder of Deeds (ROD) Time Study Results

County	# of County-paid ROD FTE	# of State-paid/split ROD-court FTE*	# ROD October Minutes Reported by Circuit Clerk	# Oct ROD Minutes Reported by Other Court Clerks	# October ROD Minutes Reported by Circuit Court (total last two columns)	# Estimated ROD Minutes/Day by Circuit Court
Atchison	.875	.125	412	265	677	31
Barry	2	No	1200	0	1200	55
Carroll	.5	No	820	0	820	37
Chariton	1	No	1315	0	1315	60
Clinton	1.4	No	238	0	238	11
Cooper	1.875	.125	345	245	590	27
Gasconade	1	No	194	461	655	30
Gentry	.5	.5	883	0	883	40
Grundy+	1	No	90	190	280	13
Harrison	1	No	584	178	762	35
Holt	.5	.5	2087	0	2087	95
Howard+	1	No	660	1420	2080	95
Maries	1	No	2445	220	2665	121
Mercer	.125	.875	1328	1199	2527	115
Moniteau+	1	No	0	40	40	2
Ozark+	1	No	410	250	660	30
Pulaski	2	No	3438	4550	7988	363
Ralls+	1	No	470	310	780	35
Shannon	1	No	145	0	145	7
Total			17,064	9,328	26,392	

+ Courts in Main Time Study

* Minutes reported by Split Position not included in Circuit Court ROD Total

Table 2. Ranking of Recorder of Deeds (ROD) Daily Time Study Results

County	# of County-paid ROD FTE	# of State-paid/split ROD-court FTE*	# ROD October Minutes Reported by Circuit Clerk	# Oct ROD Minutes Reported by Other Court Clerks	# October ROD Minutes Reported by Circuit Court (total last two columns)	# Estimated ROD Minutes/Day by Circuit Court
Moniteau+	1	No	0	40	40	2
Shannon	1	No	145	0	145	7
Clinton	1.4	No	238	0	238	11
Grundy+	1	No	90	190	280	13
Cooper	1.875	.125	345	245	590	27
Gasconade	1	No	194	461	655	30
Ozark+	1	No	410	250	660	30
Atchison	.875	.125	412	265	677	31
Harrison	1	No	584	178	762	35
Ralls+	1	No	470	310	780	35
Carroll	.5	No	820	0	820	37
Gentry	.5	.5	883	0	883	40
Barry	2	No	1200	0	1200	55
Chariton	1	No	1315	0	1315	60
Howard+	1	No	660	1420	2080	95
Holt	.5	.5	2087	0	2087	95
Mercer	.125	.875	1328	1199	2527	115
Maries	1	No	2445	220	2665	121
Pulaski	2	No	3438	4550	7988	363
Total			17,064	9,328	26,392	

+ Courts in Main Time Study

* Minutes reported by Split Position not included in Circuit Court ROD Total

There is a great deal of variability in the amount of time Circuit Clerks and their deputies spend on Recorder of Deeds activity. Size of court, as measured by its weighted workload, only explains about one-third of the variability ($r^2 = .318$, $F = 7.92$, $df = 17$, $p = .012$). Other factors to consider are the number of county-paid staff available in the Recorder's Office and the proximity of the Recorder of Deeds' office to the Circuit Clerk's office. One Circuit Clerk stated he would spend more time at the Recorder of Deeds' office if it were closer to the court. Another highlighted the inconvenience of having the Recorder of Deeds workstation on the other side of the office. However, some counties have the Recorder's office in the Circuit Clerk's office and so the Circuit Clerk is always available to do Recorder of Deeds work.

The median – or 2nd quartile – (35 minutes or .073 FTE) is a better estimate of the central tendency for the time study results than the mean (63 minutes, or .13 FTE) because the very large amount of minutes reported by Pulaski County (over 6 hours per day) skews the mean (See Table 2). However, given that:

- five counties spend more than twice the median on Recorder of Deeds activity,
- there is a very large range of value for minutes per day spent, and
- unique county-specific circumstances (e.g., location of offices, number of county-paid staff) appear to cause some Circuit Clerks/court staff to spend more time doing Recorder of Deeds activities,

a higher value – or credit – may be more equitable for all counties concerned. The 75th percentile – or 3rd quartile – of the time study results is 95 minutes (Howard County), which is approximately 20% of a 450-minute workday (or .198 FTE). This value is the current adjustment/credit (0.2 FTE) approved by the CCBC for Recorder of Deeds work performed by the Circuit Clerk in counties with shared positions.

2013 CWWL WEEKLYRECORD OF DEEDS ACTIVITY TIME SHEET

Please report your time spent on Recorder of Deeds activity between Oct 1 and Oct 31. If you do Recorder of Deeds work uninterrupted for large blocks of time, report the large block of time. Note activity in general for the block of time reported. **FAX OR SCAN AT THE END OF EACH FRIDAY AND ON OCT 31st to Karen at 303-583-8378.** No cover sheet needed, but note number of pages coming at bottom of page.

Name	County	Email	Phone
------	--------	-------	-------

[illegible]